

REVIEW OF GITCHELL:

A REPLY

TO HIS REASONINGS CONCERNING

The Sabbath, the Covenants, and the Law.

BY ALVIN MARSH.

"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him."—Prov. 18:17.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH.:
REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING CO.
1888.

Vault

BV

125

.M38

c.2

HER.

The Tithing System; Or, The Divine Plan for supporting laborers in the cause of God. By Eld. G. I. Butler. An extended treatise. 112 pp. 10 cts.

Matter and Spirit. A philosophical argument on an interesting theme. 66 pp. 10 cts.

Refutation of 44 so-called Object ons to the ANCIENT SABBATH. By D. T. Bourdeau. 10 cts.

Bible Sanctification. By Mrs. E. G. White. 82 pp. 10 cts.

The Seven Trumpets. An exposition of the subject, as set forth in Revelation, chaps. 8 and 9. 96 pp. 10 cts.

The Truth Found. The Nature and Obligation of the Sabbath. By Eld. J. H. Waggoner. 64 pp. 10 cts.

Vindication of the True Sabbath. By Eld. J. W. Morton, formerly Missionary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church to Hayti. 68 pp. 10 cts.

Hope of the Gospel. By Eld. J. N. Loughborough. 80 pp. 10 cts.

Christ and the Sabbath: or, Christ in the Old Testament, and the Sabbath in the New. By Eld. James White. 56 pp. 10 cts.

Redeemer and Redeemed. By Eld. James White. This work sets forth the plan of Redemption in its three stages. 40 pp. 10 cts.

Thoughts on Baptism; Its Action, Subjects, and Relations. By Eld. J. H. Waggoner. 25 cts.

The Rejected Ordinance. A carefully prepared argument on our Saviour's Act of Humility recorded in John 13. 64 pp. 10 cts.

The Honor Due to God. Thoughts on Tithes and Offerings. By Eld. E. J. Waggoner. A plain Bible exposition of the tithing system. 10 cts.

The Position and Work of the True People of God under the Third Angel's Message. By Eld. W. H. Littlejohn. 10 cts.

Life of Christ and his Apostles. 8 books, paper covers. 90 cts.

The Saints' Inheritance; or, The Final Home of the Saved. 10 cts.

The Sunday Seventh-Day Theory Examined. A refutation of the discordant views on that subject. Paper covers. 10 cts.

An Appeal to the Baptists, for the Restoration of the Bible Sabbath. Paper covers. 10 cts.

Key to the Prophetic Chart. A valuable publication. 6 cts.

TRACTS.

5 cents each. Our Faith and Hope. Justification by Faith. The poet Milton on the State of the Dead. An Explanation of the Prophetic Symbols of the Bible (Illustrated).

4 cents each. Redemption. The Second Advent. The Sufferings of Christ. The Present Truth. Origin and Progress of S. D. Adventists. Ten Commandments not abolished. Address to the Baptists. The Two Thrones. Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion. Samuel and the Witch of Endor. The Third Message of Rev. 14. Scripture References. Seventh Part of Time. A Greek Falschood.

2 cents each. Second Message of Rev. 14. End of the Wicked. Lost-Time Question. Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists. Signs of the Times. Who Changed the Sabbath? The Spirit of Prophecy. The Millennium. Sabbath.

2 cents each. Christ in the Old Testament. The Sabbath in the New Testament. The Old Moral Code not Revised. The Sanctuary of the Bible. The Judgment. Much in Little. The Two Laws. Seven Reasons. The Definite Seventh Day. Departing and Being with Christ. The Rich Man and Lazarus. Elihu on the Sabbath. First Message of Rev. 14. The Law and the Gospel. God's Memorial. The Sabbath Made for Man. Bible Conversion, and Sanctification.

1 cent each. The Coming of the Lord. Perfection of the Ten Commandments. Without Excuse. Thoughts for the Candid. Which Day and Why? Can we Know? or, Can the Prophecies be Understood? Is the End Near? Is Man Immortal? The Sleep of the Dead. The Sinner's Fate. The Law of God. What the Gospel Abrogated. One Hundred Bible Facts about the Sabbath. Sunday not the Sabbath. "The Christian Sabbath." Why not Found out Before? A Sign of the Day of God.

Candid Admissions in reference to the Bible Sabbath, from Sunday observers. (On this paper) Per hundred, 25 cts.

HEALTH PUBLICATIONS.

Manual of Health and Temperance. A book bristful of information on a hundred useful topics, with department on cooking. 320 pp. 75 cts.

Digestion and Dyspepsia. By J. H. Kellogg, M. D. This work embodies the results of the author's experience in dealing with all forms of the disease, in all of its stages, and is a thoroughly practical treatise on this prevalent malady.

Paper covers, 25 cts. Cloth, 75 cts.

Uses of Water in Health and Disease, giving careful and thorough instruction respecting the uses of water as a preventive of disease, and as a valuable remedy.

In cloth, 166 pp. 60 cts.
Paper covers, 136 pp. 25 cts.

Lectures on the Science of Human Life. By Sylvester Graham. Three lectures of great value which should be in the hands of every individual. 114 pp. 30 cts.

Diphtheria. A concise account of the nature, causes, modes of prevention, and most successful mode of treatment of this now prevalent and fatal disease. With 4 colored plates, 64 pp. 25 cts.

Alcoholic Poison; or, the Physical, Moral, and Social Effects of Alcohol as a Beverage and as a Medicine. The best compendium of the temperance question published. Its statements are brief, concise, and to the point. 128 pp. 25 cts.

Evils of Fashionable Dress, and How to Dress Healthfully. Enamel covers, 40 pp. 10 cts.

Proper Diet for Man. A scientific discussion of the question of vegetable versus animal food. Ultra notions are avoided, and the subjects treated are handled with candor. 15 cts.

Health and Diseases of American Women. 60 pp. 15 cts.

The Hygienic System. Full of good things. 15 cts.

TRACTS.

3 cents each. Wine and the Bible. Startling Facts about Tobacco.

2 cents each. Pork. The Drunkard's Arguments Answered. Alcoholic Medication. Twenty-five Arguments on Tobacco-Using Briefly Answered.

1 cent each. Causes and Cure of Intemperance. Moral and Social Effects of Intemperance. Tobacco-Using a Cause of Disease. Tobacco-Poisoning; Nicotiana Tabacum. Effects of Tea and Coffee. Ten Arguments on Tea and Coffee.

½ cent each. Alcoholic Poison. Tobacco-Using a Relic of Barbarism. True Temperance. Alcohol: What is It? Our Nation's Curse.

Full Catalogues of all our publications, in English, and the various Foreign Languages, furnished free, on application.

For anything in this Catalogue address,

REVIEW & HERALD, Battle Creek, Mich.
Or, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.

CATALOGUE OF PUBLICATIONS

Issued by the Review and Herald Publishing Association, Battle Creek, Mich.

PERIODICALS.

The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald. A 16 page Religious FAMILY Newspaper, devoted to a discussion of the Prophecies, Signs of the Times, Second Coming of Christ, Harmony of the Law and the Gospel, What we must Do to be Saved, and various Bible questions. \$2.00 a year.

The Gospel Sickle. A live bi-weekly paper, devoted to those important Bible doctrines which are especially applicable to the present time. Single copies, post-paid, per year, 50 cts.

Good Health. A monthly journal of hygiene, devoted to Physical, Mental, and Moral Culture. By all odds the best health journal in the world. Ought to be in every household. \$1.00 a year.

The Youth's Instructor. An excellent 4-page illustrated weekly for the Sabbath-School and family. Every fourth number is double size. 75 cts. a year.

Sandhedens Tidende. A 16-page Danish semi-monthly, devoted to expositions of Prophecy, the Signs of the Times, and Practical Religion. \$1.00 a year.

Sanningens Harold. A 16-page Swedish semi-monthly, magazine form, of the same character as the SANDHEDENS TIDENDE. \$1.00 a year.

Regular editions of both the *Tidende* and *Harold* are issued in Christiania, Norway, from duplicate plates.

Herold der Wahrheit. A 16-page German semi-monthly devoted to prophetic expositions, the Signs of the Times, Hygiene and Temperance, and Practical Religion. \$1.00 a year.

De Bijbel Lezer. A religious monthly in the Holland language, containing 16 large octavo pages, committed to Prophetic Exposition, Signs of the Times, Health and Temperance, Practical Religion, News, etc. etc. 75 cts. a year.

The above are published at Battle Creek, Mich. Terms always in advance.

The Signs of the Times. A 16-page weekly Religious Paper, devoted to the dissemination of light upon the same great themes treated in the REVIEW. Published in Oakland, Cal. \$2.00 a year.

The American Sentinel. An 8-page monthly, devoted to the defense of American institutions, opposed to a union of Church and State. Address American Sentinel, Oakland, Cal. Single copy, post-paid, per year, 50 cts.

Pacific Health Journal and Temperance Advocate. Devoted to Temperance Principles and the Art of Preserving Health. 32 pages bi-monthly, published at Oakland, California. 50 cts. a year.

Present Truth. A 16-page semi-monthly, issued at Grimsby, England, at 75 cts. a year. This is a stirring periodical, largely used for ship work and other missionary purposes.

The Bible Echo and Signs of the Times. A 16-page monthly, published at Melbourne, Australia. A vigorous exponent of those Bible truths which are of especial importance at the present day. \$1.00 per year.

Les Signes des Temps. A semi-monthly religious journal in French. Published in Basel, Switzerland. \$1.30 a year.

Herold der Wahrheit. A 16 page German semi-monthly. Published at Basel, Switzerland. \$1.00 a year.

L'ultimo Messaggio. A 16-page Italian quarterly. Published at Basel, Switzerland. 25 cts. a year.

Adevarul Present. A 16-page Roumanian quarterly. Published at Basel, Switzerland. 25 cts. a year.

Sundhedabladet. A 16-page Danish-Norwegian health and temperance monthly. Published in Christiania, Norway. 80 cts. a year.

Hälsö-och Sjukvård. A Swedish monthly health journal of the same size and character as SUNDHEDSBLADET. Published in Christiania, Norway. 80 cts. year.

BOUND BOOKS.

Thoughts on the Books of Daniel and the Revelation. (In one volume.) A judicious exposition of these two prophetic books in the light of history, ancient and modern. The text is commented upon, verse by verse, with no skipping over the hard places. A most useful work for both public and private use. Sold only by subscription.

Complete History of the Sabbath, and the First Day of the Week. By the late Eld. J. N. Andrews. A mine of information on this all-important question. Treats the subject from a Biblical and Historical standpoint. New edition, revised. Now ready. 548 pp. \$2.00

Thoughts on Daniel. Critical and Practical. By Eld. U. Smith. An exposition of the book of Daniel, verse by verse. 416 pp. \$1.25

Thoughts on the Revelation. By Eld. U. Smith. This work presents every verse in the book of Revelation with such remarks as serve to illustrate or explain the meaning of the text. 420 pp. \$1.25

The Sanctuary and the 2300 Days of Dan. 8:14. By Eld. U. Smith. This work explains the great Advent movement, and makes plain the present position of those who wait for the Lord. 332 pp. \$1.00

Condensed edition, paper covers, 224 pp. 30 cts.

Synopsis of the Present Truth. A work which gives an epitome of the faith of the S. D. Adventists. It treats upon every essential point of their faith. Uriah Smith, author. (Revised edition) 336 pp. \$1.00

Bound Volumes of Testimonies to the Church. 4 Vols. in muslin (each \$1.50). The set, \$6.00

The Bible-Reading Gazette, containing 162 Bible readings on a great variety of subjects. Large octavo size, in muslin. 288 pp. \$1.00

The Atonement: An Examination of a Remedial System in the light of Nature and Revelation. By Eld. J. H. Waggoner. 368 pp. \$1.00

The Nature and Destiny of Man. By Eld. U. Smith. This work treats on the great questions of the condition of man in death, and his destiny beyond the resurrection. (New, revised edition) 443 pp. In paper covers, 50 cts. Cloth. \$1.50

REVIEW OF GITCHELL:

A REPLY

TO HIS REASONINGS CONCERNING

The Sabbath, the Covenants, and the Law.

BY ALVIN MARSH.

"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him."—Prov. 18:17.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH.:
REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING CO.
1888.



LIBRARY of
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY



236344

Handwritten:
BV
125
M38
C.2
MER.

A REVIEW OF GITCHELL

ORATION COMMUNICATED

TO THE READER.

THIS treatise on the Sabbath is presented to the public because a certain person, C. S. Gitchell, who claims to be a minister of the gospel, has taken it upon himself to write a small book in opposition to those who believe that the only weekly Sabbath of the Bible is the one enjoined in the fourth commandment of the decalogue, or ten commandments. This production is a review of his statements, by comparing them with Scripture. Please give it a careful perusal.

A. M.

A REVIEW OF GITCHELL.

CREATION COMMEMORATED.

MR. GITCHELL opens his argument with the following statement :—

"We have nothing in the word of God to warrant the statement that, in the beginning of the human race, every seventh day was to be used as a celebration day to commemorate the creation. Nor do we find in our surroundings anything pointing to or inviting such a rest day. However, to introduce a few brief thoughts, we will, without a scriptural foundation, take the unrelenting position, and suppose there was a day given to man in which to celebrate the creation. So, then, the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath was to commemorate the works of God, as displayed in bringing from nothing worlds and systems, with their appendages, and the various laws to govern them."

The fourth commandment, recorded in Ex. 20 : 8-11, gives information where and by whom the Sabbath was made, and tells why no work should be done on that day. This clearly refutes Gitchell's statement in the onset ; for it refers us back to the creation, and so connects the Sabbath with that event as to leave no excuse for not accepting it as God's memorial of creation, given to man — the very first man — to celebrate that event.

But if any are dissatisfied with this conclusion, plain and necessary as it is, we will look a little further into God's word.

We turn to the first chapter of Genesis, and there find a plain narrative of the events of the first six days of time, telling what was done on each successive day. The narrative continues in the second chapter, and gives the events of the seventh day. Can we reasonably claim that what is here said of the seventh day is not a record of what took place at that time, but of what was done 2,500 years afterward, in the days of Moses? No one with a

sound, unbiased mind could ever take such a position; yet, my friends, this is the only way of escape from the position that the Sabbath originated at creation, and not at any subsequent period.

And what are the events here recorded? 1. God rested on that day. *Sabbath* means "rest," and any day, to be a Sabbath, must be a day on which some divine being has rested. Then the Sabbath of the Lord must be the day on which he rested. We have his own word to that effect, and there is no record that he ever rested on any other day; therefore no other day ever has been, or can be at the present time, the Sabbath of the Lord. But the record does not stop here. 2. He added his blessing. "And God blessed the seventh day." There is no record that his blessing has ever been removed from this day, or that any other day has taken its place; hence the seventh day must still be the blessed and holy Sabbath of the Lord. 3. He "sanctified it [thus making it a Sabbath for man]; because that in it he had rested from all his work," etc. To sanctify is "to set apart to a holy or religious use."—*Webster*. The Hebrew word *kadash*, rendered "sanctified" and "hallowed," is defined by Gesenius, "to pronounce holy, to sanctify, . . . to institute any holy thing." Therefore God instituted the Sabbath in Paradise after the first seventh day had passed; for he blessed and sanctified it "because that in it he *had* rested." Gen. 2:3. The fact that the seventh day was then sanctified is positive proof that a commandment was then given for its observance; for it would be impossible to institute or set apart anything without plainly giving a commandment for its observance or instructions for its use. When the Lord, in giving his law on Mount Sinai, spoke of his rest day, he declared it to be the very one which he had blessed in the beginning. "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:11. We have no record that this blessing and sanctification have ever been removed; hence the Sabbath is still the blessed and sanctified rest day of Jehovah.

We have learned how, when, and by whom the Sabbath was made. Now, for whom was it made? Jesus answers, "For man." Mark 2:27. Please compare this

with Gitchell's statement that there is "nothing in the word of God to warrant the statement that, in the beginning of the human race, every seventh day was to be used as a celebration day to commemorate creation." Preposterous assertion! How opposed to the Bible! Astonishing it is, that man will thus falsify in order to serve his purpose!

Here we mark Gitchell against the Bible, No. 1.

On the fifth page of his book, Gitchell admits that if man had not fallen he could keep the rest day of God "from evening till morning, fulfilling its rounds through time or eternity."

Abraham was a descendant of fallen man, yet he obeyed God, and kept his charge, his commandments, his statutes, and his laws. If Abraham observed all these, he must have observed the Sabbath; for God's word, statutes, and law required its observance.

"But man did not continue in his primeval innocence; for, *ere the period of its first commemoration, sin entered the world*, man fell, and a permanent change took place throughout all the sublimary creation."

Gitchell here professes to be wise above what is written; for there is no statement in the Bible from which to draw an inference that Adam sinned the first week of time.

Gitchell against the Bible, No. 2.

On the sixth page, Gitchell treats his readers to another assumption. He says:—

"God's cursing man and driving him from the magnificent garden, and sending a stream of death through every avenue of nature, and all terrestrial objects withering beneath the vengeance of violent justice, *calls more for a Sabbath to commemorate woe and destruction occasioned by sin than a Sabbath as a memorial of God's lovely and grand creation that now stands blighted, defaced, and in ruins.*"

All this is assumption, and consequently not worth a reply, further than to set it down as—

Gitchell against the Bible, No. 3.

He continues:—

"Here we find reason why Scripture is as silent as death on the commemoration of the creation, if God ever intended it to be celebrated."

In reply to this it is sufficient to say that the Bible does not, after giving directions or commandments on any point of duty, always follow it with a record of how many walk out in obedience. But the Lord's word does tell plainly how it is that the earth has become defiled. Isa. 24:5, 6: "The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant. Therefore hath the curse devoured the earth, and they that dwell therein are desolate," etc. Will Gitchell still claim that the Bible is as silent as death in regard to the Lord's ordinance and his everlasting covenant?

Gitchell again, on page 6, proceeds as follows:—

"Our work in these pages being to correct the absurd statements concerning the seventh-day Sabbath as obligatory upon the Christian world, we shall appeal to the word of God, and deduce from it our proof."

We reply, All right; let us have the word of God. Thus he proceeds:—

"We stated, at the commencement of the prosecution of this question, that the world had no Sabbath for four thousand years. Two thousand five hundred thirteen years from the creation, God, by commandment, gave to the children of Israel a Sabbath day; but this Sabbath was given to no other nation. Those who would impose the seventh-day Sabbath upon the public, take for their foundation the scripture containing the rest day of our Creator, which scripture we will investigate."

He then cites Gen. 2:2, 3; but as we have already noticed this text, showing that God himself referred the children of Israel to the facts therein contained as the reason why he required them to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, we will now hear what Gitchell says on this point:—

"Why did God rest after his six days' work? He has nowhere recorded the reason."

No record given why he rested! "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them." Gen. 2:1. "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Verse 3. If God

blessed and sanctified the seventh day because he had rested on it, he also rested on it that he might bless and sanctify it. God's resting on the seventh day did not make it a holy day; but the Sabbath, or rest day, of the Lord became a holy, blessed, and sanctified day by Jehovah's act of blessing and sanctifying it. We call attention again to the Hebrew word *kadash*. (See p. 6.) This amounts to nothing less than a plain record that God instituted his holy Sabbath in Paradise, after the first seventh day had passed.

But let us hear what Gitchell says about this, as he continues his investigation of this record on the seventh page of his book:—

"Why did he [God] bless and sanctify the seventh day?—Because he rested on that day, and was refreshed.

"Did he not sanctify all seventh days to come?—He only speaks of sanctifying the one on which he rested.

"What is it to sanctify?—To set apart."

This we regard as giving up the issue. He has certainly given us the handle of this argument, and taken hold of the blade. If God set apart the seventh day, to what did he set it apart?—Most certainly to be a day of worship. Did he ever unsanctify it?—He did not. Then it remains sanctified, and the Lord told the truth when he said to the children of Israel, "Six days shalt thou labor, . . . but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; . . . for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Thus the great champion has got himself into a net from which none of his adherents or brethren will be able to deliver him. This is good evidence of the imbecility of his system, and that he contends against the truth.

God did set apart the seventh day in Eden by sanctifying it.—*Gitchell*.

The seventh day is the Sabbath.—*Bible*.

Therefore, taking Gitchell with the Bible, it follows that the Sabbath was instituted in Eden.

We here mark Gitchell with the Bible, No. 1.

What Scripture does Gitchell find to warrant him in making the assertion that the world was without a Sabbath for 4,000 years?—None; for there is not even one syllable to be found. But he denounces those who do take scripture as the foundation for their position that the Sabbath was instituted in Paradise; and by criticising the scripture, instead of proving the people wrong in their conclusion, lo, he has proved them sound, and in perfect harmony with the record itself! How gladly we will do the same for him in turn, if so be that we find him in harmony with God's word! But he fails to produce scripture proof for his statement. He does say (p. 10),—

"There are reasons which assure us that the world was without a Sabbath for four thousand years, except the Israelites, who had a Sabbath given them for a period of near one thousand five hundred years."

And his reason is,—

"There is no record, sacred or profane, giving evidence of such a Sabbath."

In the first place, we will just mention the fact that Gitchell differs as widely from all scholars that have written on this point as he does from us. The Westminster divines, so-called, state that the seventh day of the week was the Sabbath from the creation of the world down to the resurrection of Christ. Smith's Bible Dictionary, and the articles of faith of nearly all, if not all, the orthodox denominations, say the same. These statements certainly have as much authority as his. But more than this, these parties quote scripture to prove their position, while Gitchell has not one text of scripture to sustain his. The fact that the Sabbath is not mentioned from Moses to David, a period of five hundred years, is just as remarkable as the fact that it is not mentioned from creation to Moses.

The obligation to keep the Sabbath day existed in the early ages of the world. It originated by God's sanctifying the day of his rest. By blessing the day because that in it he had rested, he extolled it, pronouncing it for all time to come a great day, and a blessed day to man. Mark 2: 27. By sanctifying the day, he set apart every

seventh day *in the future* to a holy use; for the first seventh day was passed when God sanctified the rest day, and past time cannot be recalled to be consecrated to the Lord. The sanctification of the seventh day could not have been carried out without God's giving our first parents instructions in regard to their use of it. He commanded that they should not do their own work on that day, but should use it religiously, in memory of God's rest. Moses sanctified Mount Sinai when Jehovah was about to proclaim his law upon it, by telling the people not to use it as they would common ground. Ex. 19: 12, 23. Then it would be impossible for God to set apart, or sanctify, the seventh day without plainly giving directions how it should be used; and as Christ declared that the Sabbath was made for man, and it was these acts of Jehovah that made his Sabbath, or rest day, a holy day, the conclusion is unavoidable that the Sabbath was there made, and our first parents were then commanded to keep it holy. God, in giving his law on Mount Sinai, commanded the hosts of Israel to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. But they could not *keep* it holy until it had been made holy; so the Lord proceeds to tell them how and when it was made holy: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." To hallow is "to make holy; to set apart for holy or religious use." —*Webster.*

We learn from this that the Sabbath was made in Eden, was made for man (Mark 2: 27), and that the original obligation to observe it was never abrogated. Even if our opponents could *prove* that the Sabbath was not kept from creation until the Jews came out of Egypt, (which cannot be done,) they would simply show that all those living during that period were Sabbath-breakers. But this is not true. Noah was a righteous man (Gen. 6: 9; 7: 1), and a preacher of righteousness (2 Peter 2: 5), which would not be true had he been a violator of the Sabbath. Lot, also, was a just man. 1 Peter 2: 7, 8. The patriarchs reckoned time by weeks and sevens of days (Gen. 29: 27, 28; 8: 10, 12), and by months and

years. There is nothing to divide time into weeks but the Sabbath. This is good evidence that the example of God in the model or creation week was not entirely forgotten at this time.

Here we have Gitchell against the Bible, No. 4.

The fact that the Bible gives no definite account of Sabbatic observance in the patriarchal age, does not prove that it was not observed in that age. This fact is no more remarkable than a great many others, one of which we have noticed,—the Sabbath's not being mentioned from Moses to David, a period of five hundred years, during which time it was enforced by the penalty of death. Again, the Bible does not contain a single instance of the observance of the jubilee, or of the day of atonement, the most solemn and important day in the typical system, and which the Jews observe to this day.

Gitchell, so far, has failed to give a single text of scripture to substantiate him in his position. His argument consists only in assumptions and misrepresentations to evade the force of the truth. If we were at liberty to manufacture scripture to suit ourselves, it would be impossible to frame sentences in the English language more to the point than those already at our hand in God's word, both from his own lips and from his inspired servants.

But we will hear Gitchell again (p. 8):—

"Those who declare it [the Sabbath] to be a day set apart to commemorate the creation, are without a single passage of scripture or a solitary example from Genesis to Revelation."

I suppose he is now preparing the minds of his readers to discover another reason why the Sabbath was given, aside from what the Lord says. But the Bible reason must stand, for the Lord himself has spoken plainly. But will any one be so daring as to repeat God's word in opposition to what Gitchell has declared? We read again:—

"Did not the children of Israel remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy? Their Sabbath was not to commemorate the creation, but was in remembrance of their deliverance from Egypt. 'Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and

by a stretched-out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.' Deut. 5:14, 15. If the Israelites kept their Sabbath in commemoration of any event, this is the one."

"If the Israelites kept *their* Sabbath"! What does he mean? Does he really mean the Sabbath they were to observe in memory of their deliverance? If so, we are inclined to think he has made a mistake, and referred to the wrong text. Is not this what he meant to read? "And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the self-same day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt. It is a night to be much observed unto the Lord for bringing them out from the land of Egypt; this is that night of the Lord to be observed of all the children of Israel in their generations. And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron, This is the ordinance of the passover." Ex. 12:41-43. Here we find an ordinance which was to be observed unto the Lord for bringing them out from the land of Egypt. There is nothing in the Sabbath adapted to commemorate the deliverance from Egypt, as that was a flight upon the fifteenth day of the first month, and the Sabbath is a rest upon the seventh day of each week. But God did give the Hebrews a fitting memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, in the passover and the feast of unleavened bread. Exodus, chapters 12, 13.

But by reading Gitchell a little further, we come to the conclusion that the text he used was for the purpose of making it appear to his readers that the *Sabbath* was given to the Israelites as a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt. Twice in connection he has called it "*their* Sabbath." We could hardly believe that a Bible student would go so far astray from the Bible as to call the Sabbath of the fourth commandment "*their* Sabbath" when the Lord has always claimed it as *his* Sabbath, *his* holy day, etc. Every time it is mentioned in the Bible it is spoken of as *the* Sabbath, the *Lord's* Sabbath, or the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Then where does he find his authority for calling it "*their* Sabbath"? Jesus says that "every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment." From this we think that it stands us in hand to be careful how we mis-

construe the Lord's words; for he especially denominated the Sabbath *his* holy day. Eze. 22 : 26.

By fair, logical argument Gitchell has not proved a point. He has dealt out a great many assertions, but these only prove that he is destitute of argument. He assumes that the events upon which the Sabbath was instituted did not transpire until the exodus. His position has no foundation in the word of God.

The facts on which the Sabbath was instituted, as already noticed, are, 1. The Lord created the heavens and the earth in six days; 2. He rested on the seventh day, and was refreshed; 3. He blessed and sanctified the seventh day, which is the Sabbath.

Why did God rest on the seventh day? because he delivered Israel out of bondage?—No; but because he designed to bless and sanctify that day as the Sabbath for man. Why did he bless and sanctify the seventh day? because he delivered Israel from bondage?—No; but because that in it he had rested from all his work which he had made.

These are the premises upon which Inspiration bases the institution, and there is not a fact upon which the institution is based but what is comprehended in the foregoing. Did these transpire before the exode? If so, then we have—

Gitchell against the Bible, No. 5.

But he contends that the deliverance of Israel from Egypt is the great event upon which the Sabbath was instituted, and argues that therefore the Sabbath did not exist prior to that event.

Well, we will examine this, feeling well assured that when we bring it to the test of the divine standard of truth, we shall discover "TEKEL" plainly inscribed upon it. The text reads: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." Deut. 5 : 15. This text does not say when the Sabbath was instituted, nor how. It is not of itself a command, but a require-

ment based upon the Sabbath command: "Keep the Sabbath . . . as the Lord thy God *hath* commanded thee." Verse 12. But where is the command as given by the Lord himself?—In Ex. 20 : 8-11. Here is given the time and manner of its institution, and the reasons for its observance. Deut. 5 : 12-15 does not give a reason or a fact for the institution of the Sabbath, neither does it, or any other scripture, say that the Sabbath commemorated Israel's deliverance from Egyptian bondage.

The Sabbath cannot grow out of both the law and the deliverance from Egypt. If it grew out of the deliverance from Egypt, it could not have grown out of the law; for, as Gitchell admits, the law was not given till thirty-three days after the deliverance. And if it grew out of the law, as he argues, and went overboard with it, then it did not exist before Israel came to Sinai. But the Sabbath did exist in the wilderness, as Exodus 16 plainly declares. But does this chapter give the history of the institution of the Sabbath? Does it say that the Sabbath was instituted in the wilderness? It says no such thing. It treats the Sabbath as an existing institution, and not as anything new. Therefore the Sabbath did not grow out of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, and was not instituted in the wilderness.

But if Gitchell's premises and conclusions are correct, it follows that the Sabbath was never binding on any man who was not a bondman in Egypt, and it forever limits the Sabbath to the generation *only* that came out of that bondage. But David, Solomon, Samuel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Christ and all the good of his time, never were bondmen in Egypt; therefore the Sabbath did not exist in their time, and was not binding upon them, according to Gitchell's argument. Why could not Gitchell have discovered the full force of all the points laid out in the above premises, and thus have saved himself the perplexity of comparing the two covenants, and of laboring to convince a few candid minds that the Sabbath is not now binding, when in fact it was only binding on a very small portion of the vast multitudes of the former dispensation? But the fact is, the Sabbath was binding after that generation had passed away; therefore neither

its institution nor the obligation to keep it, owe their origin to Israel's deliverance from Egypt.

The fallacy of Gitchell's reasoning may be further shown by applying it to other scriptures. Notice Deut. 24:17, 18, and Lev. 19:35-37: "Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless, nor take a widow's raiment to pledge; but thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence; therefore I command thee to do this thing." "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, . . . I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt. Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them." By applying Gitchell's process of deduction to these scriptures, we would reason as follows:—

Cause: "Thou wast a bondman in Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence."

Effect: Therefore "thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless, nor take a widow's raiment to pledge."

It is evident that where a cause does not exist there can be no effect. Therefore those who never were redeemed from Egyptian bondage were never under any obligation to refrain from perverting the judgment of the fatherless and widow. Again:—

Cause: The Lord "brought you out of the land of Egypt."

Effect: Therefore "ye shall do no unrighteousness." (What is unrighteousness?—"All unrighteousness is sin." 1 John 5:17.) "Ye shall observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them."

These obligations rest only on those who were delivered from Egypt; therefore all others can sin, and show disrespect to the judgments of the Lord. This shows to a demonstration that Gitchell errs, not understanding either the Scriptures or logic. But what is the true import of this text, which he so severely tortures?—Evidently this: When the Israelites were servants in Egypt, they could not keep the Sabbath; but God delivered them from their slavery, and they became freemen; then they could keep the Sabbath, and the Lord required it of them. The

scriptures above referred to must be explained in the same way.

The subject of the law Gitchell introduces on page 10:—

"The world was without law from Adam to Moses, and then the law was given to none but the children of Israel."

He then quotes the following texts in support of his position: Rom. 5:13, 14: "Until the law sin was in the world. . . . Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." Rom. 2:14: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves." John 1:17: "For the law was given by Moses." Rom. 3:2: "Unto them [the Jews] were committed the oracles of God." He then comments thus:—

"The Gentiles were deprived of these advantages. To sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression is to have a law and violate it. Now, as there was no law from Adam to Moses, how was there a 'remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy'? And as the Gentiles were without law, they were without a Sabbath to keep."

Shall we understand by the expression "until the law," that there was no law until God proclaimed it from Sinai? Paul could not have so understood it; for he adds, "But sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." Rom. 5:13, 14. The apostle here, instead of teaching that there was no law from Adam to Moses, brings a threefold argument to prove that the law was in force during that period. 1. He speaks of sin. What is sin?—"Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. 2. He refers to the law. "Where no law is, there is no transgression." Rom. 4:15. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3:20. Transgression of the law is sin; hence by this law he determines that all are sinners. Rom. 5:12. "I had not known sin, but by the law." Rom. 7:7. 3. He shows what is the penalty

for sin. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." If death came into the world by sin, it follows that death is the penalty for sin. "But sin is not imputed when there is no law." Therefore the fact that death did reign from Adam to Moses proves that the law existed during that period.

Gitchell says:—

"To sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression is to have a law and violate it."

If indeed he is correct in this statement, then it follows that *not* to sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression is to have a law and obey it. Then the fact that there were those that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, is positive proof that they obeyed God's law, while others transgressed it; and as there can be neither transgression nor obedience where there is no law, all must have had a knowledge of it.

Where, then, does Gitchell find his clear evidence that there was no law from Adam to Moses? There is no such proof to be found in the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation. The statement is wholly gratuitous on his part, yet he asserts it as strongly as though he had a hundred texts of scripture to prove it.

Gitchell asserts that the ten commandments were first given to Moses. If this be true, God gave no law for the moral government of men prior to the exodus of Israel from Egypt. Therefore the world was without law from Adam to Moses; hence, without sin! This is a monstrous conclusion! But we have conclusive evidence that the law of God did exist, and was binding from Adam to Moses, the entire period of the patriarchal age.

First: The sacred writers assert that there were righteous men in that age.

Proof: "Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous." Heb. 11:4. Paul, speaking of all the patriarchs, says, "Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness," etc. Heb. 11:33. "And [God] spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth per-

son, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly." 2 Peter 2:5. "Noah was a just man, and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God." Gen. 6:9. "And the Lord said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation." Gen. 7:1. "And Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him." Gen. 5:24. "For before his [Enoch's] translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God." Heb. 11:5. These are all said to have been righteous, to have "wrought righteousness," to have "walked with God." Many more examples might be adduced, but these are enough to prove our position. Righteousness is right doing; and the opposite is sin, which is transgression of the law.

Second: Ps. 119:138, 172, shows that the law of God is the standard of right—of righteousness. Hence those who do right and work righteousness must conform to this divine standard.

Proof: "And it shall be our righteousness if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us." Deut. 6:25. We have proved that the patriarchs did right, "wrought righteousness;" therefore God's law existed in their time, and they conformed to it.

There is still stronger proof that the Sabbath law existed and was binding before the Israelites arrived at Mount Sinai. "Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law, or no." Ex. 16:4. God then had a law concerning the Sabbath. The Israelites, of their own accord, and without any new commandment from the Lord or from Moses, prepared to keep the Sabbath, by gathering a double portion of manna on the sixth day; but this seemed to be against the arrangement that it should not keep over two days; and so "all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses" (verse 22), and then he informed them that it would keep over the Sabbath, which relieved their perplexity. "And when some of the Israelites violated the Sabbath, the Lord re-

proved them, saying, "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?" Verse 28.

Third: The idea of a previously existing institution is seen, not only in the first words of the fourth commandment, "*Remember* the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," but also in the closing words of that precept, "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it" (at creation). Ex. 20:8-11. The very day enjoined by the fourth commandment was sanctified, or set apart to a holy use, in Eden. Therefore, the command given to the Israelites, to keep the Sabbath day, is but the repetition of a previously existing law.

Gitchell versus the Bible, No. 6.

GIVING OF THE SABBATH.

UNDER this heading Gitchell claims that the Sabbath was given to the Israelites, and them only. He proceeds as follows (p. 11):—

"I will not rehearse the life of Abraham, or trace his posterity down the four hundred and thirty years to the exodus, but simply say: The time had come when the Lord was to fulfill his promise to Abraham and receive his posterity, bless and care for them above other nations. . . . They were woefully demoralized, and greatly needed deliverance. With a strong hand he led them forth, and extended his arm to defend them. He brought them with all their effects out of Egypt; they crossed the Red Sea, and came in safety to the waters of Marah."

"The law was given to them at Marah, but they had not yet been tested. Now he brings forward a part of the law, and proves them, to see if they will walk in it or not; and the part brought is, whether they will keep one day in seven holy. If they had the law before, they certainly had been tested, or proved, which would make this a vain expression."

The Lord had at this time delivered them from their bondage, where they had been deprived of their liberty; but now being liberated, they could keep the Sabbath, and the Lord required it of them; so it was not a vain thing that they should here be tested, whether they would walk in his law, or not.

Gitchell had just been relating these circumstances when he made the statement, "If they had the law before, they certainly had been tested, or proved." Where? during their servitude, when the circumstances were such that they could not keep the law? Did he make this statement to prove that God had required of them something which he had by his direct providence made an impossibility? Gitchell here claims that the manner in which the Sabbath is alluded to, in connection with the gathering of the manna in the wilderness, is proof that the people had no previous knowledge of it. See pp. 12, 13, where these points are quite fully brought out.

On this, Gitchell remarks (p. 14),—

"The teaching and explaining which Moses gave to both rulers and people go to convince fully that the Israelites had never kept a Sabbath before this one, and were perfectly ignorant of when and how to keep it. . . . How could it be said, The Lord hath given you the Sabbath, when they always had it and always kept it?"

God gave them the Sabbath by placing them in a condition where they could keep it. Gitchell says:—

"This is the first Sabbath given to man."

To this we reply, It must, then, have been the one enjoined in the fourth commandment of the decalogue; for the Lord there refers them back to the creation for its origin, saying that in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and rested on the seventh day, and hallowed it, and assigned this as the reason why they should remember it to keep it holy. The Lord here referred them to this fact in order that they should understand it to be the Sabbath first given to man. Hence it was the identical seventh-day Sabbath by which the patriarchs divided time into weeks (Gen. 29:27),—the one given at the beginning, and the only one ever enjoined for weekly observance. Consequently it is the only Sabbath for the keeping of which God has ever promised a blessing, or for the desecration of which he has ever pronounced a curse.

We think this is sufficient to warrant us in setting Gitchell down with the Bible, No. 2.

Gitchell again:—

“See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath.’ This teaches that God gave *Israel* the Sabbath. Not to the Gentiles; no, not even to their fathers. ‘And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily, my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.’”

That the Lord here refers them to the same Sabbath day on which he rested, his words fully prove. “Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep.” Ex. 31:12, 13. But we have seen that the Lord’s Sabbath must be the day on which he rested; hence this also refers them back to the beginning for its origin. This idea is again expressed in verses 16, 17 of this chapter: “Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations [for what?] for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.”

Gitchell comments thus:—

“In Egypt, every day was exacted in heavy task labor; not one could they claim as their own. The Lord took them from this bondage, and exacted one day in seven, and called it his, and demanded them to cease from their labor, and keep it sacred.”

Why did the Lord demand that they should cease from their labor on that day?—Because in six days the Lord had made heaven and earth. Why did he call that day his?—Because he hallowed it after his rest. How ingeniously Gitchell labors to keep all these facts out of sight! He continues:—

“Notice: ‘It is a sign between me and you throughout your generations.’ This was not a sign between God and other nations, but between him and them, and the sign was that God sanctified, that is, set them apart, above, or to greater privileges than other nations. This was ever known among the Jews as God’s holy day.”

How did the Jews come to know that this was God’s holy day?—Because God had claimed it, and had ever styled it his holy day. Gitchell endeavors to cover up this fact, by trying to palm off upon us the idea that the Jews were the ones who called it God’s holy day. Again:—

“Nehemiah says (9:14): ‘[Thou] madest known to them thy holy Sabbath, and commandedst them precepts,’ etc. When did he make known to them such a day? If they always had it, of course they knew there was such a day from their childhood up; and to twist it about demands plenty of small sophistry.”

Neh. 9:14 is referred to as proof that the Sabbath was instituted in the wilderness. “Thou madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath, and commandedst them precepts,” etc. Gitchell here tries to keep out of sight an important fact. We will read, commencing with verse 13, “Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments; and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath.” On this he argues: Israel knew nothing of the Sabbath before it was made known; for, says he, “If they always had it, of course they knew there was such a day from their childhood up; and to twist it about demands plenty of small sophistry.” But when was it made known? Gitchell says, In the wilderness; but Nehemiah says it was made known on Mount Sinai, thirty days after they had been tested on the Sabbath in the wilderness, according to Ex. 16.

Gitchell against the Bible, No. 7.

What must the honest reader think of the candor and Christianity of a man who will so glaringly pervert the Scriptures to serve his purpose? The very same argument which he uses to prove that the Sabbath did not exist before it was made known, will also prove that God himself did not exist prior to making himself known to Israel in Egypt.

God did make himself known to Israel in Egypt.

Proof: Eze. 20:5: “Thus saith the Lord God, In the day when I chose Israel, . . . and made myself

known unto them in the land of Egypt." Therefore, according to Gitchell, God came into being in the land of Egypt; neither had Israel a previous knowledge of him. If they had, he could not have made himself known unto them there.

Such is the reasoning of this profound logician! and such is the legitimate result of his reasoning!!

Israel knew God before he made himself known to them; for they had been his peculiar people since the days of Abraham, and he heard their cries because of their task-masters. Ex. 3:7. Therefore if Israel knew God before he made himself known in Egypt, they might have known the Sabbath also before Nehemiah says it was made known to them on Mount Sinai.

Proof: Exodus 16.

His position is again shown to be groundless by our Saviour's language concerning circumcision. Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision; (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers.) John 7:22. If the giving of the Sabbath to Israel shows that it was not before known, but had its origin with that people, then Moses' giving them circumcision proves that it had its origin with that people; and the Lord's making himself known to Israel in Egypt proves that he came into being at that time, and they had no previous knowledge of him.

Such, then, is the legitimate result, in this case, of following Gitchell's method of arguing. The Lord had enjoined the ordinance of circumcision upon Abraham and his family four hundred years previous to the time that Moses gave it to them, and it had been retained by them. Israel had a knowledge of God before he made himself known to them in Egypt; for they had been his peculiar people from the days of Abraham. They had the Sabbath at least thirty days before they came to Mount Sinai, where Nehemiah said it was made known to them. Hence this expression of Nehemiah's can only signify its more complete unfolding. God made himself known to them in a special manner in their deliverance; and Moses gave unto them circumcision because it was of the fathers.

Gitchell says that the Sabbath was a sign to them,

and to them only, throughout their generations; that "God sanctified, that is, set them apart, above, or to greater privileges than other nations."

We admit that God set them apart from all other nations, but it was because all other nations had given themselves to idolatry. Finding the family of Abraham faithful, he chose them as his special representatives in the earth, to preserve his truth and a knowledge of himself and his worship in the world. As the most expressive sign that could exist between him and his people, he gave them his Sabbath. But was this to signify their deliverance from Egypt?—It was not. Was it based upon any reason particularly Jewish?—It was not. But, in harmony with the fourth commandment, it pointed back to creation for its origin, and the reason given for it was, because in six days God made heaven and earth, and rested on the seventh. The Sabbath, therefore, on the part of the people, signified that they were worshipers of the true God; and on the part of God, that he who sanctified them was the great Jehovah, the Maker of heaven and earth. Ex. 31:13, 16, 17.

Aside from this, there is not a statement in the Bible that the Sabbath could have been a sign even to Israel; certainly, in the great events of creation week, other nations have an equal interest with the Jews; and when the middle wall of partition was broken down, and the Gentiles were taken in to be fellow-heirs with them of the promises of God, would it not be a sign to them as much as to the Jews? The Sabbath has nothing Jewish in its nature. It is God's great memorial of himself. It is a safeguard against worshipping other gods who have not made the heavens and the earth; and hence it is a great bulwark against atheism and idolatry.

In view of the above facts, it is no less than absurd to claim that the Sabbath was not designed for all nations, and was not to be observed by all who owe allegiance to God. But it was only to last throughout their generations. Who says this? It is not to be found in the Bible. How long a time was meant by "your generations"? We conclude by the manner in which Gitchell alludes to it, that

he would have his readers understand that the generations of Israel only reached to Christ. But in order to make this good he would be under the necessity of proving that not a single Jew has been born since the birth of Christ; that through some unaccountable means the vitality of the Jewish nation suddenly ceased, and the race expired with the generation then living. But suppose we admit, for argument's sake, that the generations of Israel did cease at the cross, would this show that the Sabbath must then cease, or that it could not be a sign between God and any other people who should become his worshipers after that?—Not at all; for it would still be true that the Sabbath was to be to them a sign throughout their generations, even though it continued to exist after the Jewish generations ceased.

The expression, "throughout your generations," allowing the generations to be literal, does not limit the existence of any institution or ordinance.

Proof: Lev. 3:17. It was a perpetual statute for Israel, throughout their generations, to eat no blood; yet God had enjoined that prohibition upon Noah, before Israel had an existence. Gen. 9:4. And after, as it is claimed, the generations of Israel ceased, the same prohibition was still obligatory upon the Gentiles. Acts 15:20. Can it be shown why it may not be exactly so with the Sabbath? The generations of Israel have not *yet* ceased; and if the Sabbath is not now binding, it must be accounted for on other grounds than this.

But Gitchell claims that the fact that the Lord gave them the Sabbath, not only proves that it originated with them, but that it consequently became their Sabbath, and theirs only. Is he ready to take the position that whatever God gave to them became exclusively theirs, was limited to them as a nation? This is the position he will *have* to take in order to make good his position against the Sabbath. But if he take it, he will surely land in the slough of atheism; for God gave *himself* to that people to the same extent, and even more emphatically, than he did his Sabbath. He declared that he brought Israel up out of the land of Egypt to be their God. Lev. 11:45. He also styled himself the "God of the Hebrews" and the

"God of Israel." Ex. 3:18; Isa. 45:3. Did he thus become their God exclusively, and did his existence thus become limited to their existence as a nation, and consequently cease eighteen hundred years ago? If such expressions as these could be found relative to the Sabbath; if we could read that God brought them up out of the land of Egypt to give them the Sabbath, or find a text which calls it their Sabbath, or the Sabbath of the Hebrews, or of Israel, there would be a little more plausibility in his position; but even then his claim would not be proved; for the same God who applies all these expressions to himself is not the God of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also. Rom. 3:29.

Christ says, "The Sabbath was made for man." Mark 2:27. This provides the Sabbath for man. For him it was made. Are the Jews the only men in the world? Is not the Gentile a man? If he is, then the Sabbath was made for him also.

Again: "Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment, and do justice; for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it. . . . Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and *taketh* hold of my covenant." Isa. 56:1, 2, 6.

In this testimony we see the following important points: 1. Any man is blessed who will keep judgment and do justice; 2. Any man is blessed who will keep the Sabbath from polluting it, and his hand from doing evil; 3. If the son of the stranger will take hold of God's covenant, and keep the Sabbath, he shall be brought to God's holy mountain, or kingdom.

Before we adduce the argument contained herein, we must show where it applies, and that is to a time in which the Lord shall gather the "outcasts," or the lost sheep of Israel (Matt. 10:6); when the Gentiles shall be gathered (verse 8; John 10:16; Rom. 10:20, 21; Isa. 65:2); when God's house, or church, is a house of prayer for all people. Isa. 56:7. The Christian dispensation, there-

fore, is the time to which Isaiah has reference in the text quoted, and the first verse shows that it applies down in the time when salvation is near; "for my salvation is near to come."

But when will salvation come, *i. e.*, eternal salvation?—At the second coming of Christ.

Proof: "I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." John 14:3. "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. 3:4. The followers of Christ "are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." 1 Peter 1:5. "Unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Heb. 9:28.

According to the foregoing testimony, the stranger has the promise of God's blessing if he will lay hold of the Sabbath, and keep it, in the gospel age, and particularly in the last part of the age.

But who is the stranger?—The Gentile.

Proof: "Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh; . . . that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." Eph. 2:11, 12.

This forever settles the great question of the rights of the Gentiles to the benefits of the Sabbatic institution. This testimony, however, proves more yet; namely, that the covenant, or constitution, of God is yet binding, and that the Gentiles shall be blessed for taking hold of it.

But what is God's covenant?—The ten commandments.

Proof: "He declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." Deut. 4:13.

Every one, therefore, who will now take hold of God's covenant, to keep the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, which is thereby enjoined, shall receive an

abundant entrance into God's everlasting kingdom. God does not promise blessings upon any one for doing that which is not essential; hence it is essential that his people now lay hold of the Sabbath, and keep it. This injunction to lay hold of the Sabbath is a positive evidence that God's people have not been keeping it; for how could they lay hold of anything they already had? To twist this about does indeed demand "plenty of small sophistry."

Isa. 58:1 plainly shows that God requires his people in the last days to leave the traditions of men and walk in his ways perfectly: "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and shew my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." In what does the transgression of God's people consist? After declaring that the fast which he accepts is "to loose the bands of wickedness" and "to let the oppressed go free," and that those who do this shall call and he will answer and guide them continually, etc., he says, "They that shall be of thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The repairer of the breach, The restorer of paths to dwell in." The next verse brings to view one of the things to be restored; namely, *the true Sabbath*, concerning which he says, "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable, and shalt honor him, not doing thine own way," etc. This shows that God's people have been doing their own work and seeking their own pleasure on his holy day. The fourteenth verse tells what will be the ultimate result of honoring the Sabbath: "Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Thus God's people, by taking their feet from the Sabbath, not only repair the breach in God's Sabbath law, but shall enjoy the blessings promised to Jacob.

THE GREAT COVENANT.

THIS is an important branch of the subject, and much depends upon a correct understanding of it. Gitchell claims that to avoid a ruinous difficulty, the Sabbatarian tells us that the ten commandments are not the covenant made with the children of Israel, when the Lord took them and led them out of Egypt, and that the ten commandments are not a covenant. But we reply: Sabbatarians are unanimous in teaching that the ten commandments are God's everlasting covenant. They have never yet made the egregious blunder of confounding them with the law of Moses; neither do they, to avoid a "ruinous difficulty," deny that they were the basis of the covenant which God made with the house of Israel. They accept all this precisely as the Bible reveals it.

When God was about to declare with his own voice his holy commandments from Mount Sinai, he said to Israel: "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." Ex. 19:5, 6. That God's *covenant*, commanded with *his own voice*, is the ten commandments, is fully proved by Deut. 4:12, 13: "And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye *heard a voice*. And he declared unto you *his covenant*, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone.

Gitchell has made a serious blunder here, and supposes that, because this law is called a covenant, it is therefore the old covenant made with Israel, which has passed away. There are various definitions of the word *covenant*, and there are various kinds of covenants. The definition given by Greenfield is: "Any disposition; . . . hence a testament, will; . . . a covenant; *i. e.*, mutual promises on mutual conditions, or promises with conditions annexed; . . . *metonymy*, a body of laws

and precepts to which certain promises are annexed." That a covenant (a contract or agreement) may be based upon a covenant or law, that is, that the law, which is called a covenant, may be the condition of a contract which is also a covenant, may be learned from 2 Kings 23:1, 3. Verse 3 reads thus: "The king stood by a pillar, and made a covenant before the Lord, to walk after the Lord, and to keep his commandments and his testimonies and his statutes with all their heart and all their soul, to perform the words of this covenant that were written in this book. And all the people stood to the covenant." The law, or commandments, written in the book was a covenant, and their agreement to keep that law was another covenant. This is precisely the relation that existed between the covenant made with Israel (Ex. 19:5-8) and the covenant commanded to them. Ex. 20:3-17. Each covenant referred to must be identified by its characteristics and not by its name. The agreement, or covenant, which is found in Ex. 19:5-8, depended entirely on the promise of the people to obey his voice when he declared to them his commandments, or covenant. This promise they broke, and therefore the contract became a nullity. A law is not invalidated, however, by a failure on the part of the subjects to keep it. Sin has no tendency to abolish the law, but rather to abolish the sinner.

Moses wrote the covenant made with Israel, but the Lord wrote the words of his covenant, the ten commandments, on the tables, and they were deposited in the ark. Deut. 10:1-4. The book of the law of Moses was put in the side of the ark. Deut. 31:26.

The argument of Gitchell is that the ten commandments are the first covenant, and the first covenant has been abolished. The main premise of this argument is false, which we will show. The following particulars are essential to all covenants: 1. The parties; 2. The time; 3. The place; 4. Its design; 5. The agreement; 6. Its dedication. We will now identify the above covenant by searching out its essential particulars:—

1. The parties. These were God and the children of Israel. Deut. 5:2, 3.

2. The time. It was made in the third month after Israel's departure from Egypt, and the same day of the month. Ex. 19: 1, 3.

3. The place where it was made. This was in Horeb. Deut. 5: 2.

4. The design or end to be accomplished by the covenant. This we find briefly stated in Ex. 19: 5: "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my *covenant*, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me." This proves that God made a covenant with them concerning another covenant which he calls *his* covenant. *Query*: What is his covenant?—It is those ten precepts which he commanded forever. "And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." Deut. 4: 13.

5. The covenant, or agreement. This was an agreement, (1.) On the part of God, to make of Israel a peculiar people, a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation; and, (2.) On the part of Israel, to obey all things whatsoever God would command. Ex. 19: 5, 6, 8; 24: 7. This is the Horeb covenant.

6. The dedication. Was this covenant reduced to writing, and dedicated?—"And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel . . . And he took the book of the *covenant*, and read in the audience of the people; and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." Ex. 24: 4, 7, 8. "Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you." Heb. 9: 18-20. The facts stated in the above scriptures are, (1.) That Moses wrote the Horeb

covenant in a book; (2.) That it was dedicated with blood. The ten commandments cannot be this covenant, for the following reasons:—

THE HOREB COVENANT.

1. The Horeb covenant was an agreement between God and Israel. Ex. 19: 5, 7, 8.

2. The Horeb covenant was made just three months after Israel's departure from Egypt. Ex. 19: 1, 2.

3. The design of the Horeb covenant was to procure obedience to God's covenant. Ex. 19: 5.

4. Moses wrote this covenant in a book. Ex. 24: 3, 4.

5. This covenant was dedicated with blood. Heb. 9: 18-20.

6. This covenant was kept in the *side* of the ark. Deut. 31: 26.

7. The Levitical priesthood grew out of this covenant. Ex. 19: 6.

8. This covenant was not made with the patriarchs, but with their children.

GOD'S COVENANT.

1. God's covenant is a covenant of commandments. Deut. 4: 13; Ps. 103: 17, 18; 111: 7-10.

2. God's covenant was proclaimed in ten commandments ~~three days~~ after the Horeb covenant was made. Ex. 19: 11.

3. The design of God's covenant was to preserve Israel from sin, that they might have life. Lev. 18: 5; Eze. 20: 11.

4. God wrote his covenant with his own hand upon two tables of stone. Deut. 4: 13; Ex. 31: 18.

5. No blood was ever sprinkled on God's covenant, the ten commandments.

6. God's covenant was placed in the ark. Deut. 10: 5.

7. No priesthood grew out of God's covenant.

8. God's covenant of commandments was given to the patriarchs. Ps. 105: 7-10; Gen. 26: 5.

But Gitchell will have it that the ten commandments constitute the only covenant that God made with the children of Israel. The foregoing reasons show the falsity of this position. We will now show that if his proof is worth anything, it proves too much, and hence proves nothing for his side. If the ten commandments are the Horeb covenant, (which they must be if there was only one covenant,) it follows that the patriarchs were *under no obligations to obey them*; for no one outside of a covenant

is under obligations to obey any of its stipulations; therefore they could all go to heaven while serving other gods, profaning God's name, murdering, stealing, and committing adultery. Thus we see that his witnesses, if they prove anything, prove too much, and therefore prove nothing.

Gitchell's labor to prove the abolition of God's covenant of ten commandments, by proving the abolition of the Horeb covenant, is spent in vain; and amounts to nothing but a *perversion of the Scriptures!*

COVENANT ABROGATED.

UNDER this heading Gitchell claims to prove that God's covenant of ten commandments is abolished. But before considering his arguments, let us look into God's word, and learn what the inspired writers have said in regard to the abolition of his commandments. David says: "Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth." "My tongue shall speak of thy word; for all thy commandments are righteousness." Ps. 119: 142, 172. These statements show, first, that God's commandments are his righteousness, and, secondly, that his righteousness is everlasting. They are equivalent to saying that the commandments are everlasting. Again: "The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure." Ps. 111: 7. Were we to inquire how sure, the answer would be found in the next verse: "They stand fast forever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness." "He hath remembered his covenant forever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations. Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac; and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant." Ps. 105: 8-10.

The first covenant of commandments, Gitchell argues, was given to Israel after they came out of Egypt. This does not seem to be David's idea of the matter; but suppose we admit, for the sake of argument, that Gitchell

is right in this, and that David uses the names Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Israel synonymously, meaning Abraham's posterity. Then what will Gitchell do with David's statement that God commanded it to a thousand generations, and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant? The word *everlasting* embraces the whole extent of duration of the object to which it is applied. In the case before us, it can mean nothing less than a thousand generations. There can be no doubt that the expression means unlimited time; but it *cannot* fall short of the time mentioned, for in that case it would be a false statement. Gitchell agrees with David that this law, or covenant, was all right in David's time; but there is a wide discrepancy between them in regard to its duration. David believed that its duration was unlimited. Gitchell does not attempt to harmonize these statements with his theory.

We will now consider what our author says in regard to the abrogation of God's covenant of commandments. His first scripture proof on this is 2 Cor. 3: 5-13: "Our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament [or covenant]; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious. Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech; and not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished."

Gitchell claims that this scripture contains clear proof that the law written and engraven in stone was abolished; but the careful reader will at once discover that all the

evidence he has adduced is contained in his own statements, instead of in the words of the apostle. We grant that this testimony proves the abolition of the former *ministration* of God's law, which ministration was the law of types and shadows (Heb. 10:1); but we deny that Paul here testifies that the moral law, the law of ten commandments, was abolished, because if he does, he contradicts himself; for he says: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Rom. 3:31. The phrase *make void* is from the Greek word *katargeo*, which in 2 Cor. 3:13 is translated "abolished," and in verses 7, 11, 14, "done away." Substituting the first rendering in Paul's epistle to the Romans, in regard to the law of God, we read: "Do we then abolish the law through faith?" Gitchell says, "Yes;" but Paul says, "God forbid; yea, we establish [confirm, ratify] the law." This proof is unanswerable; it can never be subverted.

This makes Gitchell against the Bible, No. 8.

Gitchell's argument stands thus:—

First premise: The ministration of death was written on the tables of stone, and was glorious.

Second premise: That which was done away was glorious.

Conclusion: Therefore that which was engraven on stone was abolished.

The first premise of this argument is not true; it is an unauthorized assumption. He assumes, 1. That the ministration was written upon the tables of stone; and 2. That the adjective *glorious* is ascribed to that which was thereon written. Neither of these points can be proved by any man living. Hence his conclusion is only drawn from his assumptions, and is worth nothing.

In 2 Cor. 3:9, two ministrations are brought to view: 1. The ministration of condemnation (Greek, *katakrisis*: "Condemnation; accusation; censure; blame; reprehension."—*Greenfield*); 2. The ministration of righteousness (Greek, *dikaïosunē*: "Divine favor; pardon of sin; justification."—*Greenfield*). The first ministration accused and condemned the sinner; the second

grants him pardon and justification through Christ. The first condemned none but sinners; therefore none but transgressors of the law came under its notice. Hence, if the law was obeyed, the ministration made no condemnations. This proves that the thing concerning which the ministration is performed and the ministration are distinct. The second ministration offers pardon and justification to the sinner,—the second ministers salvation to the lost. Hence, before man needs the grace and pardon thus offered, he must be a sinner, a transgressor, not of the ministration or gospel, but of the law; for "sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. The commandments were appointed to life, to all who obeyed them (Lev. 18:5; Eze. 20:11, 13, 21; Rom. 7:10), and the penalty for their violation was death (Eze. 18:24; Rom. 7:10); hence obedience to the law was the cause of life to him who obeyed, and disobedience was the cause of death to him who disobeyed. In this sense only is death said to have been written. The apostle used a form of speech which frequently occurs in the Bible. A similar expression is found in 2 Kings 4:40: "O thou man of God, there is death in the *pot*,"—not literal death, but a cause of death.

But what was done away? "The ten commandments," says Gitchell; but Paul says, "That which was *vailed*." What was vailed? the ten commandments?—No; but the glory of Moses' face. Ex. 34:35. This glory represented the glory of the typical system, and the passing away of this glory represented the passing away of the whole ceremonial ministration. Says Paul: "Which *glory* was to be done away." Therefore 2 Cor. 3 does not prove the abolition of any of the precepts of God's law of ten commandments. The law and its ministration are two things. There is no sane man living, that I know of, except the Jews, that believes the former ministration is still in force; and if Gitchell will turn his attention to what the Saviour taught, he will behold him enjoining obedience to every one of the precepts of his Father's law, declaring that not one jot or tittle should pass from the law till all (not all the law, but

all things, Greek) should be fulfilled. He will also behold him throughout his whole ministry laboring to defend the Sabbath from Pharisaic abuse, defining what was lawful, or according to the Sabbath law, to be done on that day. He will also find him commending it to the peculiar affection of his disciples by styling himself its Lord. If we love the Lord of the Sabbath, we will also love his Sabbath.

Gitchell next introduces Rom. 7: 1-6: "Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them who know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man so long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. . . . But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held."

Gitchell (p. 20) says:—

"No scripture can be more explicit than this, that the law is dead. A figure is produced to illustrate the fact. When the husband is dead, the woman can marry another man. The law became dead that we might accept grace, and live under another covenant. Let those who tell us that this is the sacrificial or ceremonial law, and not the decalogue, please read the next verse: 'What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.' The law St. Paul declares dead, is the one that says, Thou shalt not covet. There was no law given to Israel that had this commandment but the one given on Sinai."

In this quotation our author gives us to understand that it will be of no avail for us to claim that this is the sacrificial or ceremonial law. We make no such claim. And it is vain for him to claim that Paul here teaches the abolition of any law. Paul, in his illustration, only speaks of the husband's being dead, which he is careful to keep

distinct from the law. He says, "Do we then make void [abolish] the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish [confirm, ratify] the law." But in opposition to this, Gitchell labors to make it appear that the law is made entirely void by the gospel.

This makes Gitchell *versus* the Bible, No. 9.

We cannot better close these remarks than by introducing the testimony of such good men as Wesley, Clarke, and others.

Wesley's "Sermons," vol. 1, Sermon 35, p. 316, edition of 1856, has the following on Rom. 3: 31:—

"It therefore behooves all who desire either to come to Christ or to walk in him whom they have received, to take heed how they 'make void the law through faith;' to secure us effectually against which, let us inquire, first, Which are the most usual ways of 'making void the law through faith?' and secondly, How we may follow the apostle, and by faith establish the law?"

"1. Let us, first, inquire, What are the most usual ways of making void the law through faith? Now the way for a preacher to make it all void at a stroke is, not to preach it at all. This is just the same thing as to blot it out of the oracles of God; more especially when it is done with design; when it is made a rule not to preach the law, and the very phrase, 'a preacher of the law,' is used as a term of reproach, as though it meant little less than an enemy to the gospel."

"2. All this proceeds from the deepest ignorance of the nature, properties, and use of the law; and proves that those who act thus, either know not Christ, and are utter strangers to the living faith, or, at least, that they are but babes in Christ, and, as such, 'unskilled in the word of righteousness.'"

"3. Their grand plea is this: That preaching the gospel, that is, according to their judgment, the speaking of nothing but the sufferings and merits of Christ, answers all the ends of the law. But this we utterly deny. It does not answer the very first end of the law, namely, the convincing men of sin, the awakening those who are still asleep on the brink of hell. There may have been here and there an exempt case. One in a thousand may have been awakened by the gospel; but this is no general rule. The ordinary method of God is to convict sinners by the law, and that only. The gospel is not the means which God hath ordained, or which our Lord himself used, for this end. We have no authority in Scripture for applying it thus, nor any ground to think it will prove effectual. Nor have we any more ground to expect this, from the nature of the thing. 'They that be whole,' as our Lord himself observes, 'need not a physician, but they that are sick.' It is absurd, therefore, to offer a physician to them that are whole, or that at least imagine themselves

so to be. You are first to convince them that they are sick; otherwise they will not thank you for your labor. It is equally absurd to offer Christ to them whose heart is whole, having never yet been broken. It is in the proper sense, 'casting pearls before swine.' Doubtless 'they will trample them under foot;' and it is no more than you have reason to expect, if they also 'turn again and rend you.'"

In Sermon 25, p. 223, he further says:—

"Here is therefore no room for that poor evasion, (with which some have delighted themselves greatly,) that 'No part of the law was to pass away, till all the law was fulfilled: but it has been fulfilled by Christ; and therefore now must pass, for the gospel to be established.'"

Now for the sake of comparison we will here insert a statement of Gitchell's which we find on page 39:—

"The covenant of the law to govern is directly opposed to the covenant of grace, which always forgives every violation to the penitent. [But according to this there is nothing to violate except the new law, or covenant.] And were the two covenants obligatory at the same time, neither God nor man would know what to do; for there would be a constant clashing. Under one offense the law would gain the day, and death would be the result. Then the gospel would have the ascendancy and forgive, so the law would defeat mercy, and the gospel would outdo justice. Thus one would be obnoxious to the other. To say we have the two covenants to govern us, and to suppose there is an inscrutable link that unites them, is more absurd than to say an irresistible force struck an immovable object."

We would have been thankful if Gitchell had led us out into the light by his clear thoughts; but as it is he has left us perfectly in the dark. In the outset he speaks of the covenant (or law) of grace as always pardoning the penitent violator. Then he most vehemently repudiates the view held by Wesley, that the law continues with the gospel; for if the law and the gospel were to exist at the same time, they would continually clash with each other. The law would condemn, and gain the day; then the gospel would have the ascendancy, and forgive; so the law would defeat mercy, and the gospel would outdo justice. Thus one would be obnoxious to the other. Then, to be consistent with Gitchell's argument, we must conclude that as the law and the gospel cannot both exist at the same time, on account of their obnoxious relations and

appositive work, we are left to the alternative condition of accepting one and rejecting the other. He has evidently preferred the latter; but we beg leave to defer our choice until we look the matter over; especially on his side of the question. The gospel, then, must be consistent with itself, and not fulfill the distinctive functions of the law, (that is to condemn the violator.) Hence, that there may be no clash in its work, it must have mercy, and pardon all. But Gitchell says that for every violation of the law, the gospel always extends forgiveness to the penitent. Very well, but what is to be done with the impenitent? Will the gospel condemn them?—Not at all; for that is exactly what the law would do, providing it were in force, and the only reason why it is not, is because it would be obnoxious in this respect. Then, according to his argument, the gospel can only grant pardon; for otherwise, it would be obnoxious to itself, as well as to the law. It then follows, as an unavoidable consequence, that it must pardon all, regardless of their character; or on the other hand, condemn all: otherwise it would conflict with itself. But in either case universalism is the inevitable result. The only difference is that in the former case it will be universal salvation, while in the latter it will be universal destruction. But it is *only* universalism in either case; and we shall find in the sequel that the inevitable result of his whole argument is universalism.

Dr. Adam Clarke, commenting on Rom. 7: 13, says:—

"Thus it appears that man cannot have a true notion of sin but by means of the law of God. . . . It would be almost impossible for a man to have that just notion of the demerit of sin so as to produce repentance, or to see the nature and necessity of the death of Christ, if the law were not applied to his conscience by the light of the Holy Spirit; it is *then* alone that he sees himself to be carnal, and sold under sin; and that the law and the commandment are holy, just, and good."

Andrew Fuller, an eminent Baptist minister, called the "Franklin of Theology," says:—

"If the doctrine of the atonement leads us to entertain degraded notions of the law of God, or to plead an exemption from its preceptive authority, we may be sure it is not the scripture doctrine of reconciliation. Atonement has respect to justice, and justice to the

law, or the revealed will of the sovereign, which has been violated; and the very design of the atonement is to repair the honor of the law. If the law which has been transgressed were unjust, instead of an atonement being required for the breach of it, it ought to have been repealed, and the Lawgiver have taken upon himself the disgrace of having enacted it. . . . It is easy to see from hence, that in proportion as the law is depreciated, the gospel is undermined, and both grace and atonement rendered void. It is the law as abused, or as turned into a way of life, in opposition to the gospel, for which it was never given to a *fallen creature*, that the sacred Scriptures depreciate it; and not as the revealed will of God, the immutable standard of right and wrong. In this view the apostle delighted in it; and if we are Christians we shall delight in it too, and shall not object to be under it as a rule of duty; for no man objects to be governed by laws which he loves."—*Atonement of Christ*, pp. 160, 161, published by the American Tract Society.

What rich and wholesome instruction these ripe and aged servants of God could derive from Gitchell's essays on the law of God! If they were yet living it would certainly be his *duty* more perfectly to expound the Scriptures to them!

The apostle Paul has said more to vindicate the law of God than any other writer in the New Testament. He is the great and universally accepted reasoner on justification; and he first used the word *justify* in relation to obedience to the law! In Rom. 2:13 he says, "The doers of the law shall be justified." This does not assert that man in his sinful state can be justified by the law; but it does most emphatically vindicate the law as a perfect rule of right, showing that it contains justifying principles; for a rule which is defective can never be a rule of justification.

In Rom. 3:1-9 Paul shows that all the world, both Jews and Gentiles, are proved to be sinners by the law. This shows that it is a universal law, to which all classes in all the world are amenable; and such a law must be the law of God, the only universal governor. Verse 20 of this chapter says, "By the law is the knowledge of sin." By this rule character is determined. This proves that the same law which will justify the obedient, will condemn the transgressor. In verse 21 the apostle says the righteousness of God is manifested without the law; that is, as we have all transgressed the law, and stand condemned by

it, we must be justified by grace, and not by the law. But he says this righteousness of God is "witnessed by the law," that is, the law of God is the measure of that righteousness which grace confers upon us. The gospel must bestow upon us just such a character as the law can approve; otherwise the law by which we shall be judged, would still condemn us in the day of judgment.

The idea held by Gitchell that the righteousness of the law differs from the righteousness of the gospel, is an error. The law as given to Israel is the measure of holiness, even that holiness of which the divine character is the model. God said to Israel, "I am the Lord your God: . . . ye shall be holy; for I am holy." As this requirement for them to be holy was based upon the holiness of his own character, both the requirement and the holiness required must be as unchangeable as his own character. The idea that the holiness or morality of this dispensation is higher than that of the past dispensation, has not the least foundation in the Bible; God's character is forever the only model of holiness given to moral agents; and the nature of moral character or of holiness can no more change than moral principles or divine attributes can change.

As righteousness consists in right-doing (1 John 3:7), and as a character can only be formed by conformity to, or violation of, a rule of right, it follows that there must be a law given by the great moral Governor which shall be the test of all actions and the measure of morality or holiness. Such a law must not only be written in the *heart* of the *few*, but it must be revealed to the world; for obedience cannot be demanded if the law is not proclaimed, nor can allegiance and submission be required until power and authority have been revealed or manifested. That the position herein taken is reasonable, all will admit; that it is scriptural may be easily proved.

There never was a time when God did not require his creatures to be holy. This requirement was placed upon the highest possible plane. It was not used in any conventional or local sense, as implying one thing at one time, and something else or something higher at another time. Thus the Lord said to the children of Israel, "I am the Lord your God: . . . ye shall be holy; for I am holy."

Lev. 11:44. He said they would be holy if they kept his law. Ex. 19:5, 6. The holiness or perfection of that law is as high as heaven itself—the very outgrowth of divine purity. This is the reason why Paul says it is a witness to the righteousness of God. Man lost that righteousness by transgression. As the holy law which he transgressed now condemns him, his only hope is in Christ, who *restores* to him that which he lost by sin. As the law is the rule of holiness, of righteousness, was ordained to life (Rom. 7:10), contains man's whole duty (Eccl. 12:13), is perfect (Ps. 19:7), is sufficient to justify the doer (Rom. 2:13), and will condemn the transgressor (Rom. 3:20), and as the gospel is a remedy for sin, of course the object of the gospel is to restore man to the position he would have occupied had he never violated God's holy law. This it does by justifying him through the merits of Christ, or pardoning his past transgressions, by converting him, and turning him away from sin to obedience. This is so reasonable that it would seem none could deny it; and it is a necessary deduction from the premises laid down for us in the texts quoted. To this conclusion we are positively shut up by the Scriptures.

But the apostle does not leave the subject here. Lest some should deny reason and feel dissatisfied with his explanation, he proceeds with a direct statement that the commandment, which was ordained unto life, he found to be unto death, because he was a transgressor. "For sin," he says, "taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me." Rom. 7:10, 11.

In regard to his illustration in the first seven verses of this chapter, the question now arises, What must be its real import? Gitcheil declares that the illustration is a figure produced to illustrate the death of the law. But what use does the apostle make of this figure? what is his conclusion? Is it that the law is dead?—No; for he says, "Wherefore, my brethren, *ye*, also, are become *dead* to the law by the body of Christ." Verse 4.

"But," says the objector, "do we not read in verse 6, 'But now we are delivered from the law, *that* being dead wherein we were held'? and does not the word *that* refer to the law, and show that the law is dead?—By no means.

The expression "that being dead" does not refer to the law; for the expression is qualified by the words, "wherein we were held." Wherein were we held while in sin? Not in the law, surely; but in a state of condemnation, or inseparably united to our old man of sin. This must die before we can be free from it, and lawfully become united to Christ. The expressions, "*that being dead*" and *we being dead to that*, are synonymous. But the best authors tell us that there is positive proof in the Greek that this expression cannot refer to the law. But we will hear Paul's conclusion on the subject: "For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." Rom. 7:8, 9. Sin was entirely dormant in Paul until the commandment (or law) came to his mind. By the light of God's law he then saw himself to be "carnal, sold under sin." Verse 14. This was no fault of the law; for that being holy, just, and good, would only condemn that which was wrong. Verse 12. Then, in order to leave no possible chance for contention, he declared his delight in the law of God, after the inward (or renewed) man. This proves that regeneration places the law in man's heart, and renders obedience to it a pleasure.

He continues his explanation still further on. In the eighth chapter and first verse he says: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. . . . For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: *that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.*"

Here is a statement confirming our whole argument in terms too plain to be misunderstood, too direct to admit of any evasion. Now as the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in them who, through faith in Christ, walk after the Spirit and not after the flesh, we must conclude that they in whom the righteousness of the law is not fulfilled do not walk after the Spirit, but are still walking after the flesh. This is another necessary conclusion; and to sustain it we have another positive declaration: "The minding of the

flesh" is the marginal reading of "the carnal mind;" and the carnal mind is declared to be enmity against God, and not subject to his law. Of course, when the carnal mind is removed, when the spiritual mind is given,—that is, when the person ceases to walk after the flesh and walks after the Spirit,—the enmity is then removed, and the mind is subject to the law of God. Then, and not till then, is the righteousness of the law fulfilled in any person; then, and not till then, can any one delight in the law of God after the inward (or renewed) man; then, and not till then, can he be in Christ Jesus, where there is no condemnation; then, and not till then, does he have the law written in his heart; then, and not till then, is he in covenant relation with God under the new covenant, made with the children of Israel.

Thus clearly is the law established, not made void, through faith in Christ. Rom. 3:31. Paul is a great and deep reasoner, and his conclusions are always based on well-established premises. He has not arrived at the conclusion that the carnal or fleshly mind is not subject to the law of God, without a good and sufficient reason. This reason is found in the fact stated in Rom. 7:14: "For we know that the law is spiritual."

The law has never changed since it was given by Jehovah. He then showed it to be a holy law, in that those who kept it would be holy. In David's time it was perfect; and in Solomon's day it contained the whole duty of man. The Saviour said it was the basis of the golden rule, and that it was the outgrowth of the principles of perfect love to God and man. Therefore, the law was spiritual before the gospel dispensation, as well as at the time when Paul wrote. If the law were carnal, as some affect to believe, the carnal mind would agree with it. But the carnal mind is opposed to it, and cannot be subject to it, even as there can be no agreement between spirituality and carnality. As well could we unite midnight and noon, or bring Belial and Christ in union, as to bring the carnal mind into harmony with the spiritual law of God.

We cannot imagine how the opposers of the law can overlook this fact. This one statement of the spirituality of the law (Rom. 7:14) should forever silence all ob-

jections to it; and with the additional declarations that the carnal mind is opposed to it, and that the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in the spiritually minded, we have here in brief an overwhelming argument in favor of the law.

But even this is not all. In connection with it we have the apostle's words that the law will justify the doer (Rom. 2:13); that by it God will judge the world (verse 12); that it makes known sin (chap. 3:20), and proves both Jews and Gentiles to be guilty before God (verses 9, 10); that it is a witness to the righteousness of God (verse 21); that it is not made void through faith, but established by it (verse 31), inasmuch as the blood of Christ was offered to vindicate the justice of God, not to supersede it: that we should not sin in order to magnify the grace of God in our pardon, but that we frustrate grace and are the servants of sin unto death if we continue in sin; that even as the law proves a woman guilty of adultery if she marries a second husband while the first is yet living, so are we guilty of spiritual adultery if we seek to be united to Christ while "the old man," or the "body of sin," is yet alive; that he himself was proved a sinner by the law; that, although the law was ordained unto justification and life, he found it to be unto condemnation and death, because he was a transgressor; and that the condemnation of man is no fault of the law, but an evidence in its favor; for man is a wrong-doer, and the law condemns the wrong, being itself holy, just, and good. In view of all these facts, how reasonable is the statement that the carnal mind is opposed to the law, and that the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in those who walk after the Spirit and not after the flesh.

In his closing remarks on the new covenant (p. 22), Gitchell says:—

"The whole law is fulfilled or completed in the experience of love. This is a spiritual covenant; the great feature and sum of it is love, and is carried on by faith. As the old covenant had its ordinances of divine service, so all the gospel is included in the new covenant."

The only error in the above statement consists in his idea that under the new covenant, love is substituted for obedience to the law. But considering all this evidence

of the morality, spirituality, and holiness of the law, how idle appears his objection, viz., that love is substituted for keeping the law! Obedience to the law lives in the very atmosphere of love. And therefore the apostle says, "Love is the fulfilling of the law." To fulfill a moral obligation means to observe or keep it, as we learn from Gal. 6:2: "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." Fulfilling is the opposite of transgressing; it is keeping. Not, as Gitchell would have it, that love is substituted for keeping, but, literally, love *is* the keeping of the law. There is no true *obedience* to God without *love*; neither is there any real *love* to God without *obedience*. They are inseparable, and obedience is the only test of love. While one apostle says, "Love is the fulfilling [or keeping] of the law," another confirms it by saying, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments."

If the carnal mind yielded at once to the force of argument and reason, it would hardly be true to its own rebellious nature. Therefore, when by reason and evident deductions its positions are overthrown, it covers its enmity under evasions. When it is proved that the law is spiritual, and that formality without the spirit of love and obedience never did and never can fulfill the righteousness of the law, then the opposers of the law make answer that we are not required to keep the letter of the law, if we keep it in spirit. Nay, more than this; they say that the letter is opposed to the spirit of the law, and so we are not only not required to keep it in letter, but if we do so it will be at the sacrifice of the spirit. Of all evasions of the truth this seems the shallowest; and yet we find it here resorted to by one from whom we should look for better things, considering his position and opportunities to understand the truth.

Admitting that the letter of a law may be kept without the spirit, we cannot admit that a law can be kept in the spirit when it is not kept in the letter. It is not true that the apostle places the letter in opposition to, or in contrast with, the spirit, as Gitchell contends. Having said that the law itself is spiritual, that the carnal mind is opposed to it, and that the righteousness of the law is ful-

filled by the faithful in Christ, he could not at the same time say anything so self-contradictory, so unreasonable and absurd.

For example, we will take the two precepts spoken by the Saviour and his apostle. The Saviour said that he who looks with lustful desire is guilty of adultery; and John wrote, "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." And yet we consider that the letter of the law is kept by him who does not actually commit adultery nor take life. But, on the other hand, we cannot consider that it is possible to keep the spirit of these precepts and break the letter. Without the letter no precept can exist; and between it and the spirit there must be perfect agreement. The spirit is that which dictates the letter.

We will now show that Gitchell has not proved a single point. He has found scripture to prove that the ten commandments are called a covenant, and because there are scriptures that speak of some covenant's being done away, he has put these two scriptures together, and declares that the ten commandments have been done away. But when we compare his conclusions with the plain testimony in the case, *Tekel* is plainly inscribed thereon. Before he can offer such a conclusion, he should prove one of two things: 1. That there was no other covenant but the ten commandments in existence when the old covenant was done away, so that it must necessarily have been the ten commandments; or, 2. If there were other covenants in existence, that the ten commandments are the one which is pointed out as done away. But neither of these has he established; hence all his labor to prove the law of ten commandments abolished, by showing that the old covenant is abolished, amounts to nothing but perversion of scripture, and affords good evidence of the weakness of his position.

That the covenant which passed away did not include the ten commandments, is fully shown by Paul's testimony concerning the two covenants: 1. The first covenant was made with Israel when they came out of Egypt (Heb. 8:9); but the ten commandments existed from the beginning, and were binding on man from Adam down; and the principles of each command, es-

pecially the fourth, are revealed to us in the book of Genesis. 2. The first covenant had ordinances of divine service and a worldly sanctuary; but the ten commandments say nothing of sanctuary services or of any system of worship. The first covenant had a priesthood, and laws regulating it (Heb. 9:6); but the ten commandments have nothing to say about priesthood. The service of the first covenant "stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances" (Heb. 9:10); but if the apostle has told us the truth in this matter, there was not one of the ten commandments in that covenant. If the ten commandments really belonged to what the apostle here denominates the first covenant, how could he make the above declaration that it "stood *only* in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation"? Had there been a reformation in the law between A. D. 60 and 64? The apostle declared in the year of our Lord 60, that the law was holy, and the commandment holy, just, and good; and the Lord declared it holy, in that they would be holy who kept it. In David's time the law was perfect; and in Solomon's day it contained the whole duty of man. The Saviour indorsed it, and declared that he had not come to destroy it. If there has been a change, therefore, it must have taken place some time between the years 60 and 64; for the apostle called it holy, just, and good, capable of making known sin; and declared it to be spiritual, established through faith, etc. These expressions Paul used in his epistle to the Romans; but now, while writing to the Hebrews, Gitchell would have us believe that he discovers that the once holy, just, and good law, which then stood high above all other laws yet revealed to man, has so changed, both in its nature and position, as to stand *only* in meats and drinks and divers washings, and *carnal ordinances*, imposed on them until the time of reformation. The above is either true or false. If true (and it must be truth if Gitchell has rightly divided the *word* of truth), then the reformation of which the apostle speaks was a change in the law of God, and that

change was from holiness, justice, and goodness to something "that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances." Heb. 9:9, 10. Such is the result of Gitchell's position in regard to the two covenants.

In Rom. 9:4, 5, Paul says: "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came." Here are eight distinct honors or blessings to the Jewish people, among which are the covenants—plural, the old and the new. We now call upon Paul to show his Gentile covenant. The Gentiles have nothing in the way of grace or favor from God, but what they received at first through the Jews. Then why should the Sabbath be despised because it was for a time in the keeping of the Jews? It had divine honor before it was given to them. It is a mistake to call it Jewish; it is never called the Sabbath of the Jews, but always the Sabbath of the Lord. It was made two thousand years before there were any Jews. Further, it was based on reasons not at all peculiar to the Jews. And again, it was distinct from Jewish rites, but was a part of that law which was not made void, but established through faith in Christ. Gitchell says it was abolished. God was the God of Israel; is he therefore the God of the Jews only? Paul says he is the God of the Gentiles also.

But as Gitchell will have it that the ten commandments were the first covenant, and that they passed away because they were given to the Jews and them only, so we say the second or *new* covenant was made with Israel and *them only*. See Jer. 31:31-34. In the eighth chapter of Hebrews, Paul quotes this entire statement by Jeremiah concerning both covenants' being made with the Hebrews; and, as if he would have no mistake on this point, he makes the following sweeping statement in Rom. 9:4, 5: "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the *covenants*, and the *giving of the law*, and the service of God, and the promises;

whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever."

Thus we see that everything of value in the plan of salvation comes to the world through the seed of Abraham, or by means of the Hebrew people. As a nation they were adopted, because they were the only nation that served the true God. And for this reason the oracles of God were intrusted to their hands. Shall we despise the law, because it was given to the Hebrews? Is it best to reject Jesus as the Messiah, because he pertained to that despised race? Shall we despise the new covenant as Jewish, because, like the old covenant, it was made with Israel? And finally, shall we reject salvation, and choose to be lost, because Christ said, "Salvation is of the Jews"? John 4: 22.

We have seen what the advantages of the Jews were, and will now inquire, What was the condition of the Gentiles, and is still, before they are grafted into the stock of Israel? Eph. 2: 11-13: "Wherefore, remember, that ye being in *time past Gentiles* in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and *strangers from the covenants of promise*, having *no hope*, and *without God in the world*; but now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ." Thus they must become Israelites. When they are adopted, they share in the name and advantages of Israel.

The apostle illustrates the change by the figure of grafting. Rom. 11: 17-20: "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive-tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree; boast *not against* the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear." Thus under the new covenant the Gentiles are grafted in, and reckoned as Israel.

When the old covenant was dissolved, and vanished away, the law of God remained to sustain, under the new covenant, a still more important relation than it did under the old. See again Jer. 31: 33: "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts." God is ever the writer of his own law. Under the first covenant he wrote it on two tables of stone; under the new he writes it on the fleshly tables of the heart, which renders obedience to it a pleasure. Rom. 7: 22: "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man." God does not say that he will make a *new* law, and write it on the heart; but the same law that under the old covenant was upon the tables of stone, is under the new written upon the fleshly tables of the heart.

What, then, is the relation of the new covenant to the law of God, or how does the making of the new covenant affect the law? What is the promise respecting the law? Is it, I will abolish my law? Is it, I will change my law, or change the hearts of my people to receive it? Is it, I will supersede my law by a better code?—No, indeed; it is entirely different from such as these. Mark the *promise*: "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts." Then instead of the law's being abolished, as Gitchell contends, it remains under the new covenant, and is more binding than before. It is magnified and made honorable. Instead of being done away, it is exalted more than ever. With this view agree all the Scriptures. Rom. 3: 31: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law."

Why will not men believe this testimony, and cease their assertions that the law has been abolished, or their vain imaginings about a new law having taken the place of the former? If we are now living under the new covenant, here are the ten commandments in all their life and power, brought home to every true believer by being stamped upon his heart by the Spirit of God.

This shows a perfect harmony between the will of the Father and the work of the Son. Any other view makes

it appear that there is a conflict between the Father and the Son, and represents the Son as changing the government of God, instead of changing our relation to it.

As the law is holy, just, good, and spiritual, and established through faith (Rom. 7:12-14; 3:31), and as man is a transgressor of it, and worthy of death under its righteous sentence, how reasonable that the Son of God should die to answer its claims on the life of the sinner, and make pardon consistent with justice, and at the same time change the condition of man, by removing his rebellion and enmity to God and his government, and bring him back into obedience to the holy law of the Father! How unreasonable is Gitchell's idea that Christ should abolish a holy, just, spiritual law, and release rebellious man from obligation to obey it! The very thought is impious, and to advocate it is to degrade the government of God, and make the blessed Saviour the minister of sin instead of the minister of righteousness.

While the scriptures herein quoted, and the unavoidable conclusions drawn from them, most decidedly refute the arguments and remove the objections of those who oppose this holy law, we must not forget that they are not the only ones who ought to be deeply interested in the question of the spirituality and holiness of the law of God. If, indeed, "it is to be stamped by the Spirit of God into our very being, so as to render obedience to it our delight, and as God's Spirit is the agency by which it is imprinted, it becomes a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart;" and if every secret thing is to be examined by its sacred light in the judgment, how jealously should we watch our thoughts and the motives of our actions!

David said, "I hate vain thoughts; but thy law do I love." Ps. 119:113. Here is presented a plain contrast between the law of God and vain thoughts. Paul, in calling the "motions of sin" (really our propensities to sin) "the law of sin" in the flesh, gives us to understand that it is uniformly in the flesh. The carnal or fleshly mind expresses the natural condition of all.

Again, the enumeration of sins in Gal. 5:19-21 as "the works of the flesh," shows that these evils inhere in the human heart; that they are not merely in the hearts

of a particular class, but in the hearts of all. Truly the heart of man is deceitful, and "desperately wicked." A proper regard for the sacredness of the law gives us a sense of these things; while the tendency of antinomianism, as was remarked by Andrew Fuller, the celebrated Baptist author, is to render its adherents self-complacent and spiritually proud, and to "excite an irreverent familiarity with God, and in some cases a daring boldness in approaching him; yet such is the strength of the antinomian delusion that it passes for intimate communion with him."

The work of Jesus, the prophet Isaiah testifies, is to "magnify the law, and make it honorable." We think he has done this; Gitchell thinks he has not, but has abolished it, which would neither magnify it nor make it honorable. We think the carnal mind is opposed to it; he thinks that open opposition to it is evidence of the highest state of spirituality. We think the truly converted delight in it; he thinks that openly opposing it, and even reviling it, is consistent with entire holiness. We think the law is spiritual, and ever has been thus from the beginning; he thinks the spirit has done away with the letter, so we are not only not required to obey it in the letter, but if we do so it will be at the sacrifice of the spirit. We think that the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in all who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit; he thinks there is no righteousness of the law worthy of the regard of those who walk after the Spirit. In all this we stand upon the plain testimony of the Scriptures; he does not. He is in open conflict with every scripture statement concerning the nature and obligation of the holy law of God. The fact that he does not see beauty and glory in the law of God should cause him to stop in his career, and consider his condition. "The law is light;" rejecting it, we are in darkness. While we oppose it, our darkness is such that we can neither see beauty in the law of God, nor realize the condition of our own hearts.

From what has been quoted in regard to the nature of the law which God gave to Israel, and from the fact that obedience to it will exalt us in the kingdom of

heaven,—that it justifies all right and condemns all wrong,—we are at no loss to conclude that it is referred to in Rev. 14: 12, where the commandments of God are connected with the faith of Jesus. And the application is the more certain inasmuch as we already see manifested the spirit of war which is prophesied of in Rev. 12: 17, as coming against those who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ. This will work out “the patience of the saints.” Compare Rev. 14: 12 and Rom. 5: 1-3.

Never in the history of the church were so many influences combining against those who keep *all* the commandments of God. We say “*all*,” for if the spirit of the sixth commandment cannot be kept by those who take life, and if the spirit of the seventh cannot be kept by those who commit adultery, neither is the spirit of the fourth commandment kept by those who profane the seventh day,—the day required to be kept in that commandment,—and substitute for it, it may be unconsciously, the observance of another day, a day which is positively forbidden to be kept as a Sabbath, by that commandment. And inasmuch as an exalted place in the kingdom of heaven is assured to all those who “do and teach” that law and those commandments which were already revealed when Jesus commenced his preaching (Matt. 5), and as the Saviour indorsed them as the condition of entering into life, we know that they are the commandments referred to in Rev. 22: 14, the doing of which will give the doer right to the tree of life, and an entrance through the gates into the city. God has revealed to us in his word that “the law is spiritual.” And in the light of its holiness and spirituality we shall be judged.

Under the heading, “Law and Gospel Contrasted,” p. 29, Gitchell draws this conclusion from Mark 16: 15:—

“We are not commanded to go into all the world and preach the law, . . . but, Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved.”

See Dr. Adam Clarke on Rom. 7: 31, as quoted on page 41, in harmony with which Gitchell remarks:—

“It is an alarm that quickens our pace to a refuge of safety. It is the cannon’s thunder to waken sleeping sinners.”

“He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” Baptism is for the remission of sin; sin is the transgression of the law; so where no law is there is no transgression; hence if the law had not been transgressed, there would have been no gospel to preach, and no baptism.

Again: the first and a very essential step toward conversion is repentance. The apostle taught “repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.” Acts 20: 21. But repentance has respect to sin, and sin is the transgression of the law; hence we must repent toward God, whose law we have transgressed, and have faith toward Jesus Christ, by whom we receive remission of sin. Faith without repentance would not avail; it would produce no genuine conversion. It is true that the law *alone* cannot convert; but Jesus gives a spirit of repentance as well as remission of sin. Acts 5: 31. If the law was abolished or so fulfilled as to be done away, there can be no repentance; and without repentance there is no genuine conversion. This leads us to doubt the genuineness of many professed conversions that are based on the faith of the abolition of God’s law. We would speak respectfully, and with the kindest regard for the feelings of all; but the law of God demands our *highest* respect, for *every* man is to be *judged* by it, but there is not an intimation in the Bible that the law will be judged by any man.

Gitchell says we are not commanded to go into all the world and preach the law. But the preaching of repentance being the first and a very essential part of the gospel, and as repentance and baptism, as well as faith, are essential to conversion, it follows that they cannot be preached without preaching the law, as without the law the gospel is unnecessary; and as Dr. Clarke says on Rom. 7: 13.

“Those who preach only the gospel to sinners, at best only heal the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly.”

The Saviour says, “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but

he that doeth the *will* of my Father which is in heaven." Matt. 7:21. The word *will* in the text is from the Greek word *thelēma*, which Greenfield's Greek Lexicon defines as design, purpose, statute, command, etc.; whereas the word *will*, meaning covenant or testament, is *diathēke*. The will of the Father as herein expressed by the Saviour, means his law, or commandments. Those only who in addition to calling Jesus Lord,—that is, acknowledging his teachings and authority,—keep the commandments of God, could enter into the kingdom of heaven. This agrees with what the Saviour said by his angel to John, Rev. 22:14: "Blessed are they that *do* his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

The law of God is made a condition of life under Christ. Will Gitchell hear him? He cannot—he dare not, and hold to his system. He declaims against hearing Moses. We now invite him to hear Christ. God has said, "*Hear ye him.*" Matt. 17:5. Christ said to the young man, "If thou wilt enter into life, *keep the commandments.*" Matt. 19:17. The young man here spoken of desired eternal life. He went to Christ and sought to learn its conditions, saying, "Good Master, what *good thing* shall I do, that I may have *eternal life*?" What a great and important question! What could more interest us? Who is better prepared to answer it than He who came down from heaven and taught with authority? Did he answer the question?—He did. Did he answer it correctly?—Most certainly. He who lived as we should live, who taught as we should teach, did well say, "*If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.*" Therefore the great Teacher, Jesus Christ, has enjoined this code of commandments as a condition of eternal life. What law is it that he enjoins as a condition of life?—Evidently not the law of types and shadows; for that never was a condition of life. Eze. 20:25: "Wherefore I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live." The connection proves conclusively that it is the law of *ten commandments*. The young man asked, "Which?"—not which *command*, but which *commandments*. This is direct proof that there

were then two codes of commandments. Hence the young man, desiring to know to which code reference was made, "saith unto him, Which?" Jesus answered, "Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother, and Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Thus he quoted the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth precepts of the decalogue, and also the second great commandment on which they hang; which proves beyond a doubt that he referred to the decalogue.

But, says Gitchell,—

"He said nothing of the Sabbath, therefore it is not to be obeyed as a condition of life."

We reply, He said nothing of idolatry, or profanity, or covetousness. Therefore the same argument would prove that he could get to heaven with other gods before him, or when profaning God's name; and, furthermore, the Saviour brought the young man to the test of the last commandment in the decalogue, and suffered him to depart in sorrow. Believest thou that all this could be if all were not included? Absurd! The young man understood by the obvious principles of logic that when the decalogue was identified, every precept contained in it was included; hence when he was told wherein he lacked, he understood that he had failed to keep all the commandments. And this is the only view of the matter that represents the Saviour as dealing fairly in this case, whereas the other view represents him as presenting conditions to the young man and afterward permitting him to leave in sorrow because of his covetousness, when covetousness had not been mentioned in presenting the conditions upon which he should have eternal life.

Christ enjoined the whole code to which he referred, as a condition of the blessing of eternal life, and made the above quotations, not to show which of them was essential to be obeyed, but to show which code of commandments must be obeyed in order to enter into life.

But Gitchell argues that Christ abolished this law at his death, and that since the abrogation we are taught differ-

ently. If the pope of Rome should thus speak, we should not be astonished, but that any minister professing to follow Christ should so teach, is simply monstrous! Such preaching is calculated simply to make infidels. His arguments maintain that since the death of Christ we are not to keep the commandments. We most frankly confess that this is *different* from what either Christ or any of his followers taught. There is, also, a vast difference between Gitchell and his "Church Discipline," which says, art. 6, p. 20:—

"The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testaments everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof, of necessity, be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral."

What a contrast we see between his arguments and the creed he has indorsed! We might here quote a score of authors indorsing the distinction between the ceremonial and the moral law, but we shall content ourselves by inserting only one more. Buck's "Theological Dictionary," art. Law, gives the following definitions:—

"Moral law is that declaration of God's will which directs and binds all men, in every age and place, to their whole duty to him. It was most solemnly proclaimed by God himself at Sinai. . . . It is denominated *perfect* (Ps. 19:7), perpetual (Matt. 5:17, 18), holy (Rom. 7:12), good (Rom. 7:12), spiritual (Rom. 7:17), and exceeding broad (Ps. 119:96)."

"Ceremonial law is that which prescribed the rites of worship used under the old testament. These rites were typical of Christ, and were obligatory only till Christ had finished his work, and begun to erect his gospel church. Heb. 7:9, 11; 10:1; Eph. 2:16; Col. 2:14; Gal. 5:2, 3."

We have shown that the position Gitchell takes is contrary to the creed of his own church; and not only so, but it arrays him against all such good men as Wesley, Dobney, Dr. Clarke, Prof. Buck, and finally against the articles of faith of nearly all, if not all, the Protestant churches of the land.

Now why should there be found such a vast difference between his teachings and those of eminent theologians? Simply this: While the latter have all studied to show themselves workmen approved of God, and not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth, the former has labored and studied to mix up and grind into one grist, both the ceremonial and the moral law, and thus to dispose of them both together. This mode of argument is very convenient, were it only lawful.

But we are not ready to dismiss Gitchell from this scripture yet. This declaration of Christ—"If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments"—certainly referred to that law which Gitchell claims was abolished; hence if the law was abolished, the teachings of Christ are yet binding, unless they also were abolished. But if they were abolished, it follows that we are now no more under Christ than under Moses. Our Saviour said, "If ye love me, keep my commandments." John 14:15. But if his teachings are abolished, this obligation is also destroyed. Here is where the pernicious doctrine of *antinomianism* leads. It ends in the rejection of what was taught by our Saviour. But the Father commands us to hear the Son. Matt. 17:5. Therefore his teachings were not abolished; for what he taught was designed for the benefit of his people in all time. It necessarily follows, therefore, that the declaration, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," is as binding now as when it was first spoken. All who would have life, and obey the sacred injunction of Christ, must keep the commandments. Hence they are not abolished; and Gitchell cannot get around keeping the commandments, on any such argument.

He thinks we are taught very differently since the death of Christ. Different from what?—Of course from what Christ *taught* when he said, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." This is either true or false. If true, the apostles since the death of Christ have taught that men need not keep the commandments of God; for nothing else would be different from what Christ taught.

We will hear these inspired witnesses speak for them-

selves. John says, "This is the love of God, that we [believe that the law of God is abolished?—No; that we] *keep his commandments*." 1 John 5:3. "And this is love, that we walk after his commandments." 2 John 6. "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 John 2:4. Is there any authority given here for sinning? Is there any difference between this and what our Saviour taught?—There is not.

This makes Gitchell *versus* the Bible, No. 10.

Again: we read in Rev. 22:14: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Gitchell cannot object that this was not spoken this side of Christ's death, for Christ himself declared it by his servant John in the year A. D. 96, about 63 years after his death. This testimony is conclusive proof, 1. That God in the year 96 had a code of commandments; and, 2. That in the Christian dispensation, obedience to this code is essential to an admittance into the city of God. We regard these scriptures as sufficient to prove our position.

1. Christ said, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine." Here the doing of the Father's will, which is elsewhere defined to be his law, is made a test of the doctrines of the gospel. Gitchell argues that the first testament, with its carnal laws and priesthood, was abolished and taken away. This we do not deny. But we do deny his illegitimate conclusion that therefore God's holy law of ten commandments was abolished. The will, or law, of his Father is that which Christ came on earth to do, because man had failed to do it. It is that which he taught his disciples to pray might be done in earth as it is in heaven. Matt. 6:10: "Thy kingdom come. Thy *will* be done in earth as it is in heaven."

2. This will is a condition of relationship with Christ. "For whosoever shall do the *will* of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." Matt. 12:50.

3. It is, as we have noticed, the condition of entrance into the kingdom of heaven. "Not every one that

saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the *will* of my Father which is in heaven." Matt. 7:21.

4. It is a condition of being heard in prayer. "Now we know that God heareth not sinners [transgressors of the law]; but if any man be a worshiper of God, and doeth his *will* [obeys the law], him he heareth." John 9:31. "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Prov. 28:9. "Yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear." Isa. 1:15. "Because they have cast away the *law* of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel." Isa. 5:24. See also Neh. 9:29, 30; Jer. 11:11; 14:10, 12; Micah 3:4; Zech. 7:11-13.

5. This will is God's law of ten commandments. "I delight to do thy will, O my God." What is God's will?—"Yea, *thy law* is within my heart." Ps. 40:8. The fact that David here uses the terms *will* and *law* synonymously, is conclusive proof that God's will is identical with his law. This is further proved by Rom. 2:17, 18: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent." How does he know God's will?—"Being instructed out of the law." Paul here, beyond a doubt, speaks of God's will as being his law. But to what law is reference made?—To the law of ten commandments. This is proved by the reference to it in verse 21, "Dost thou steal?" (break the sixth commandment,) and in verse 22, "Dost thou commit adultery?" (break the seventh commandment.)

6. Christ came to do this will. "Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings, and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein. . . Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." Heb. 10:8, 9. For Christ to do his Father's *will* was far more desirable to God than all burnt sacrifice, in which he had no pleasure; therefore Christ came to do God's will; to obey his law, the violation of which is sin; to magnify it and make it honorable. Isa. 42:21. He did not come to destroy it (Matt. 5:17), nor to make it void. Rom. 3:31.

On Matt. 5:17 Gitchell says (p. 41),—

"To fulfill is to fill up, to complete. To fulfill a contract, is to finish and end it."

That Christ came to fulfill the law and the prophets, we believe and admit. The word *fulfill*, as here used, is from the Greek *plero-o*, which signifies "to fulfill," "to teach, preach."—*Greenfield*. "To complete by performance; to answer the requisitions of."—*Webster*. "To ratify."—*Campbell*.

Therefore Christ, in fulfilling the law, did not kill it or take it away, but taught it, preached it, ratified it, obeyed it. Gitchell argues "that the law came to an end when it was fulfilled." We see, however, that there is no such idea in the text. Christ did not say that the law would end or pass away, but he declared that till heaven and earth should pass, not one iota or least part of the law should fail till all was fulfilled. All of what?—Both law and prophets. Have the prophets all been fulfilled yet?—They have not. Therefore the least part of the law has not passed away. This is the major premise of our Saviour's argument to show that the law of which he was speaking is perpetual in its obligations.

But why did Gitchell stop where he did? Why did he so garble and pervert the language of Christ by tearing the above scripture from its connection?—Evidently because he knew the next verse, if quoted, would overturn his whole theory of no-lawism. Hear it; it is the conclusion which Christ drew from the above premise: "Who-soever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 5:19.

Of what law was our Saviour speaking? The connection shows very clearly that he was talking of the law of ten commandments; for in verse 21 he quotes the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill;" and in verse 27, the seventh, "Thou shalt not commit adultery."

The phrase "kingdom of heaven" is translated "reign of heaven" by Campbell. (This translation is considered an improvement on the common version.) Christ therefore teaches, 1. That whosoever shall do, and teach others

to do, the precepts of this law, shall be of great esteem in the reign of heaven. 2. That whosoever shall violate one of the least of these precepts, and teach others to do so, shall be of no esteem in the reign of heaven.

But could obedience to this law be a condition of receiving the esteem of God in his kingdom if the law were abolished, or if its fulfillment had made an end of it, as Gitchell claims?—It could not. Therefore his witness testifies against him, and proves that the law of God is still binding, co-extensive with the duration of heaven and earth.

This makes Gitchell *versus* the Bible, No. 11.

Gitchell's theory that when a law is fulfilled it comes to an end proves too much, as we will now show. Christ requested baptism of John, saying, "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Matt. 3:15. Did Christ abolish all righteousness in his baptism? Gitchell's argument says, Yes, for that which is fulfilled is done away. This proves, then, that the righteousness connected with baptism, which would include the institution of baptism itself, was abolished, and passed away when Christ was baptized.

"Bear ye one another's burdens, and so *fulfill* the law of Christ." Gal. 6:2. This commandment Paul gave the Galatians. Did they obey it? If so, they fulfilled it, and hence abolished it, according to Gitchell. Therefore if his position is true, that when a law is fulfilled it is abolished, done away, it is also true that, 1. Christ by fulfilling his Father's law abolished it, and took it away; and, 2. That the church at Galatia fulfilled the law of Christ, and so abolished that, and took it out of the way. Therefore the world since then has been without *any* law. Does not this look a little like no-lawism?

That Gitchell is wrong in his conclusion is self-evident. James proves that the law of God was binding in his day, notwithstanding Christ had fulfilled it. And he enjoins upon all Christians the duty of obeying it. He says, "If ye *fulfill* the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well." James 2:8. James, what law do you mean?—That law

which said, "Thou shalt not kill," and "Thou shalt not commit adultery." What is the consequence of violating this law? — "But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convicted of the law as transgressors." Verse 9. Why is this? — "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." Verse 10.

This testimony proves, 1. That the law of God is binding in the Christian dispensation, and must be obeyed; 2. That the law referred to is the code of ten commandments; 3. That the violation of this law is sin, and that by it is the knowledge of sin. See also 1 John 3: 4; Rom. 3: 20; 4: 15.

The authority of God is as much involved in one precept of his royal law as in all of them, and may be repudiated in all if it is in one. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." This certainly includes the Sabbath. The word *abolish* Webster defines, "To put an end to; to terminate; to do away with; hence, to annul or destroy; to make void; to annihilate." Therefore if Christ abolished his Father's law, he killed it, destroyed it, made it null and void, and put an end to it! This he says he came *not* to do, as we have noticed. Therefore he did *not destroy* or *abrogate* the law, he came to fulfill it; and hence if he abolished any law, it was another one.

Gitchell *versus* the Bible, No. 12.

Gitchell (p. 44) quotes this passage: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants; the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage." Gal. 4: 21-24. Then he proceeds: —

"You can see that the son of the bondwoman is the covenant of Sinai, the law of ten commandments. . . . 'The son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.' That is, there shall be no uniting of the two covenants as though they were to be combined, and accomplish a work together. We are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free."

To keep the law of ten commandments, he says, constitutes one a child of the bondwoman; and consequently to disobey the law of ten commandments is to become a child of the freewoman. He says we are not children of the bondwoman. The avowed object of his argument is to show us that to the same extent that we obey the law of ten commandments, we adopt Hagar in our system, and become her children. He assumes that the ten commandments are the bondwoman; then all who keep them serve the bondwoman. If his assumption be true, it follows that Abraham served the bondwoman; for he certainly kept the commandments of God. Gen. 26: 5.

We now call attention to Gitchell's remarks on page 49: —

"Intelligence lies at the foundation of *natural law*. Natural law is the intuitive knowledge of right and wrong which every man has by nature. 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to any graven image, or likeness of anything, nor serve them, for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.' Man's own nature teaches him that it is an insult to his intelligence to bow down and worship anything having neither life nor mind; also, that homage and adoration belong alone to our Creator, and that his name should be revered and kept sacred, used only when petitioning, or in devotional worship. These three commands, we find, are natural law designating the relation that should exist and be practiced by every creature of intelligence toward his Creator.

"Honor thy father and thy mother. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor. Thou shalt not covet."

The query is, Does Gitchell indorse all the above-mentioned commandments? If so, we would remind him of his own words, p. 24: —

"To drag in the old covenant, in order to hang on to the seventh-day Sabbath, which was local, and given only to one nation, is an offense against the covenant that came through Jesus Christ, and is, and will be, repugnant to, and thrown away by, every Christian nation."

We would just remind the reader that Gitchell's avowed position has been that the ten commandments were the old covenant, that it is dead, fulfilled, and done away; that this law gendered bondage; and that those

who obeyed it were all children of the bondwoman. He seemed to congratulate himself very highly that he was not a child of the bondwoman, and had nothing of Hagar in his system; and now, behold, he has betrayed to the world that he and his brethren *have nine tenths of Hagar in their system*; for they acknowledge nine at least of the commandments to be binding.

Notwithstanding the untiring efforts of Gitchell and his colleagues to *cast out and exterminate Hagar*, they, *themselves being judges*, have cast out only one tenth of her; and seeing it is a difficult task to get entirely rid of Hagar (*for she clings to them like a sister!*) they have concluded to keep *nine tenths of her*, which they have dressed up in a new gown of *no-lawism*, and called SARAH!!

Paul applies his allegory to the Jewish church, which grew out of the Horeb covenant, and not out of the ten commandments; therefore Hagar was *cast out* when the first covenant was taken away, which was the Horeb covenant, and not the ten commandments.

But how about those nine precepts of the decalogue which Gitchell denominates as "natural law"? Where has man acquired a knowledge of the only true and living God? Has nature disclosed to him the fact that there is only one God who made the great universe and all things therein?

In nature we see sunshine and storm, glory and gloom, health and disease, plenty and famine, comfort and misery, life and death, bloodshed, carnage, and mutual destructiveness visible throughout the animate creation; and from man, the head, to the insect that crawls beneath his feet, instincts of mischief, strife, and violence prevail. Nor does the conscientiousness of the human heart afford any better rule of right.

Man's conscientiousness is not a rule of right and wrong, but an adaptation of his nature to *receive* such a rule. It is true that the great Godhead may be seen in the light of nature; but whether there is one god or more, and whether he is righteous or unrighteous, just or merciful, gracious or severe, nature has never declared. Under its light men have become cannibals, barbarians, and villains of every grade. They have worshiped

wooden gods and stone idols; cats, dogs, birds, and creeping things; winds, storms, and the elements; dead men, and living men who have long deserved to die. All these have been the subjects of the misguided reverence and blind adoration of those who had *only* the light of nature and the monstrosities of tradition to guide them in this world.

Without some more definite rule than this, man must perish in sorrow and sin. He who links pain, sorrow, and death to vice, sin, and wickedness, and binds joy, peace, and blessings as a garland on the brows of Virtue and Uprightness, certainly has a most decided choice concerning man's conduct, and a most positive rule by which he may be controlled and judged. Such a rule must not only *exist*, but it must be *revealed*; for obedience cannot be demanded until the law is proclaimed, nor can obedience be required until power has been revealed or manifested.

God has once spoken to man with authority, while the mountain quaked, the earth trembled, and the hearts of the people fainted before the manifestation of divine majesty. And now shall we allow our better judgment to be imposed upon by a man who tells us that God has repealed this law, and so obscured his own authority as to re-enact nine of those precepts in a private manner, so that no man can understand them only as he may perchance discover them through the imperfections of his own nature, and thus is exposed to ignorant transgression and its eternal consequences? Have we under the new covenant, only the light of our own natures to guide us into the paths of truth and virtue and uprightness? Gitchell argues here that the Christian's *natural feelings and reason* are a sufficient moral guide! Thus under the new covenant *all are infallible*. This is the *essence of popery*. Any theory that compels one to resort to such weak impositions for its support, is *of itself* sufficient evidence of its *imbecility*, and will be *so considered* and thrown aside by every person of intelligence. Is *this* what Gitchell denominates a *better covenant*? Is it not more reasonable to believe that God so legislated at first as never afterward to find himself under the necessity of giving a *new*

law to man, and then resorting to weak, impotent human nature as the best medium through which he could reveal it? O shameful confusion! O Egyptian darkness!

Gitchell says that intelligence lies at the foundation of natural law. Then common sense lies at the foundation of sound reasoning. But does not his position, if true, reflect upon the wisdom and goodness of God? Listen to his words again (page 42):—

"The first dispensation had no Sabbath, therefore the benefit that the Israelites and the Christian world derived from having such a rest day never fell to their profit. The Sabbath to Israel continued them in worshipping God, and adhering to their law which brought temporal blessings, and also insured the pleasure of God. Without this Sabbath their degradation would have equaled the heathen nation. Had it not been for the Christian Sabbath the gospel [of] salvation would not have been propagated, and those embracing Christianity, with few exceptions, would soon be swallowed up in the labors, cares, and weariness of life. The Sabbath, with its sanctity, is so great a benefit that no one can demonstrate its importance, unless he could weigh the ruin and perdition of nearly the entire human race."

In the above Gitchell stultifies his own argument. He declares, 1. That the first dispensation had no Sabbath; 2. That without this Sabbath the degradation of the Israelites would have equaled that of the heathen; 3. That had it not been for the Christian Sabbath, the gospel of salvation would not have been propagated; and, 4. That the Sabbath, with its sanctity, is so great a benefit that no one can demonstrate its importance. He speaks in a commendable manner of the Sabbath as a beneficent institution; but who can fathom the depth of his folly, or measure the height of his presumption, when he positively and repeatedly affirms that the first dispensation had no Sabbath; thus insinuating that for more than one third of the time that has passed since God created the world and all things which are therein, man, whom God formed after his own likeness, has known nothing of this beneficent institution?

What sort of reverence does this show for God, to insinuate that he withheld this great blessing, thus depriving man of what he most needed in order to secure the highest end of his being? This virtually charges God,

who has ever sustained the same relation to man, with purposely withholding from him the only institution that could have kept him above the degradation of the heathen, thus robbing him of that which was indispensable to secure his highest moral good. It also represents God as being deceitful; for he claims to have provided it at the beginning. See Ex. 20: 8. We ask again, What kind of reverence is this that represents God as thus deceiving, not only the Israelites, but the whole world, for nearly six thousand years?

God worded the Sabbath commandment so as to give them to understand that it was instituted at creation, and assigned that as a reason why he commanded them to keep it holy. He then permitted his servant Moses to give a plain, unvarnished account of what was done at the creation, and how the seventh day of creation week was made the Sabbath by the Lord himself first resting on that day, and then sanctifying and hallowing it, thus sending it forth to the world with all the authority of his creative power.

The fact that the day was sanctified (as we have before stated) is the record that a commandment was given for its observance. Gitchell admits that to sanctify is to set apart, which would be impossible without plainly giving a commandment for it, or directions how it should be used. And when God, in giving his law on Sinai, spoke of his rest day, he declared it to be the Sabbath day at the time it was blessed: "Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." But it was blessed in the very beginning, as the Lord declared, and everybody has understood that it was the Sabbath at that time; so if Gitchell's position is true, the Lord has so collated his history on the origin of the Sabbath as to deceive the world for nearly six thousand years,—until Gitchell and his colleagues have succeeded in detecting and exposing his deception.

Why, then, does he lay so much stress on the error of those who keep the Sabbath to commemorate creation, and so entirely pass by the *same error* in all those who observe another day to commemorate another event? Is there either reason or propriety in thus continuing to

cast opprobrious epithets on one class, while the other is lauded to the heavens, and while both are alike involved in the same great error? Why not first see to the cleaning of his own house, before devoting so much time and expending a farm (as he stated in the town of Hope) to exposing the faults of his neighbors?

He further asks:—

“If the Sabbath was instituted before the fall, who can conceive its necessity? for Adam no more needed such a day than an angel of heaven.”

No matter, then, we suppose, if Adam (according to Gitchell's arguments) *should* fall into the degradation of the heathen, and worship idols. Such is the incongruity of his multifarious, heterogeneous, self-contradictory statements. God has given us a true balance by which we may weigh the testimony on both sides of this important question. It is this: Confusion is not of God. The testimony of his witnesses will agree. On the other hand, the advocates of error will be found contradicting one another, and often contradicting themselves.

Let us weigh the evidence on both sides of this question according to God's rule: Go the world over, among all who keep the seventh-day Sabbath, and you will hear but one reason assigned for keeping it. It is a plain, simple story, and a child can tell it. God in six days created the heavens and the earth and all things in the earth, and rested on the seventh day, and sanctified it, thus commanding it to be kept holy. He assigned this same reason when making Israel the depositaries of his law, at Sinai; and declared it to be a sign between himself and them throughout their generations. And there still are Israelites upon the earth, both the natural seed and the true Israel of God. Understand the term *Israel* as you may, the Sabbath is still obligatory upon them, and a sign of the true God.

The last line of the 28th page of Gitchell's book reads as follows:—

“The law was a crushing weight, an embitterer of life.”

And in the previous paragraph he says:—

“The law brings in a rule of righteousness which is antagonistic to man's nature, and puts him to death for violating it.”

After drawing a comparison between man's condemnation under the law and the great blessings of the gospel, and denominating the law a yoke that could not be borne, and asserting that we are not called upon under the gospel to preach the law, etc., he then says:—

“Now, what shall I do with the law? Shall I anathematize it because it is abrogated?—No! Shall I annihilate it?—No! Shall I dismiss it from my mind and memory?—No! What shall I do with it then?—Remember it is a glorious blessing from God, for it imparts light. It is a lamp for our feet, a guide for our path. It is a mirror that reflects many of the attributes of Jehovah. It points out lofty positions that we may attain through the grace of God. It is an alarm that quickens our pace to a refuge of safety. It is the cannon's thunder to awaken sleeping sinners. It is the storm's most awful roar to arouse the hardened, reckless man who is almost doomed and almost damned. Every man living should praise God that the law is in the world, although we are not under its government; for it imparts knowledge wide as immensity, high as the throne of God, and deep as the stream of life.”

Here are several statements that are very closely connected, occurring on pages 28 and 29 of his work. In order that we may duly appreciate some of them, I take the liberty of connecting them a little closer; as, for example, “The law was a crushing weight, an embitterer of life,” occurs on page 28, last line; and on the next page he says, “It is a mirror that reflects many of the attributes of Jehovah.” Then many of the attributes of God are a crushing weight, an embitterer of life. These are his words, and they may be his sentiments. They are expressive of the carnal mind, which is said by the apostle to be enmity against God, and not subject to his law.

Again, on page 28 he says, “The law brings in a rule of righteousness which is antagonistic to man's nature, and puts him to death for violating it;” but on page 50 he says that nine of the precepts of God's law are in perfect harmony with man's nature, and determine the relation existing between God and man, and between man and his fellow-man.

Here we may mark stultification, No. 1.

But now he takes it upon himself to reveal its imperfection by comparing it with man's nature. It brings in a rule of right antagonistic to man's nature; and what is worse, it puts him to death for violating it. But the gospel, he says, *changes* man's nature, and adapts *him* to righteousness. The latter we believe to be the truth; for we have the words of an inspired witness to prove it. Rom. 8:1-4. This text shows that the righteousness of the law must be fulfilled by every Christian who walks after the Spirit and not after the flesh; for those who do walk after the flesh are carnally minded, and are not in harmony with God, being opposed to his law. Verse 7. But this enmity to God and his law must be removed before the righteousness of the law can be fulfilled by us, and we be in Christ, where there is no condemnation.

But what was Gitchell's object in saying that the gospel changes man's nature, and adapts him to righteousness? Did he inform his reader how this change was brought about? Did he tell him that his righteousness, while in Christ, was measured by God's standard of right, that God's law ever has been, and ever will be, that standard? Did he intend to say that the object of the gospel was to *restore* the sinner to the position he would have occupied had he never violated God's holy law? that the gospel must bestow upon him just such a character as the law can approve; otherwise we are still under condemnation? Nothing of the kind! But he is trying to befog the mind of his reader, and make it appear that the law of God is opposed to the gospel of Christ, and that there can be no union between them.

To say that the law is still in the world without governmental qualifications, would be a contradiction of terms; for the word *law* signifies "a rule of order or conduct;" hence if a law has existence, it has jurisdiction. Therefore, when Gitchell concedes the fact that God's law is in the *world*, he virtually admits that the world is under its jurisdiction. And here he surrenders the hilt of his argument. Read again what he says (quoted on page —) about anathematizing, annihilating, and dismissing the law. He has hoisted too much sail for the size of his ship, and it has run him out from shore into deep water, and upset his bark. His whole cargo is now afloat.

"Little ships must keep near shore;
Larger ones may venture more."

Gitchell says, "Shall I anathematize it [the law] because it is abrogated?—No!" O no! he would not do that; neither would he dismiss it from his mind, but remember it as a glorious blessing from God! We believe that every one who is in Christ, where there is no condemnation, will delight to do this. But does Gitchell really mean what he says? Does he do this?—No; for he still endeavors to excommunicate it, and load it with the reproach of Judaism. He also denies its governing power, and thus denies its existence; for, as we have noticed, it could not be a law in any sense of the word without having jurisdiction or control. Hence, if the law of God is in the world, as he admits, we are certainly under its government.

Gitchell finds fault with the law, and considers Paul's statement that none can be justified by it, an evidence that we are not under its government. A law that would satisfy its own violation, would be good for nothing. It would nullify itself, and be an evidence of supreme foolishness on the part of the lawgiver. Human legislatures, in their enactment of laws, have never been marked by any such folly as this; and may the Lord have mercy on those who will not receive his law because it is not stamped with imperfection far exceeding anything yet attached to human enactments!

On page 54 Gitchell says:—

"In order to evade a destruction to their seventh-day-Sabbath theory, the Sabbatarians inform us that there were two laws which governed Israel, and the ceremonial law was the one done away in Christ. Remember, no legislation or imperial enactment can, under any circumstances, become a law, without a penalty to enforce its claims. There was a penalty annexed to the decalogue, but was not written on the tables of stone. It is found in the ceremonial part of the law. So the ten commandments alone do not amount to a law, and of necessity require the attachment of the ceremonial which contains the penalty. Thus the decalogue and the ceremonial combined constitute the law. Therefore, there was but one law given to Israel. 'The law and the prophets were until John,' not laws! 'The law came by Moses,' not laws! 'Christ is the end of the law,' not laws! 'The law was our school-master to bring us to Christ,' not laws!"

Gitchell declares that no legislative enactment can under any circumstance become a law without a penalty to enforce its claims. Yet he has been sagacious enough to find every commandment, except the fourth, binding in this dispensation without the death penalty. Let us turn upon him his own argument, "Can there be a law without a penalty?" How does he have these commandments binding? Where will he find his penalty to enforce Sunday as the Christian Sabbath? Here he has run his ship clear up on dry ground.

In his arguments on the law, and the acuteness of his tact in trying to separate the fourth commandment from the other nine, he reminds me of the course taken by a Quaker to kill his neighbor's dog. He had been harassed by the dog's frequently finding the way into his cellar, and finally succeeded in fastening the dog into it over night. When he went down cellar the next morning the dog was somewhat frightened, but the Quaker called him by name, and told him he was a good fellow, etc. He then said to him, "I will not kill thee, nor harm thee, but I shall give thee a bad name." He then turned the dog loose, and ran after him, crying at the top of his voice, "Bad dog, bad dog, bad dog!" The consequence was, the people understood him to cry, Mad dog! and soon dispatched the animal.

Gitchell argues that every vestige of the law has disappeared, and that those who hold that even one tenth of it is now binding, and teach men so, are guilty of committing a great offense against the covenant that came through Jesus Christ; and then he turns right around, and argues that nine tenths of the old covenant have been dragged over into the new, and that they now occupy a very prominent place in that covenant which came through Jesus Christ.

Law is the basis of government. Without law all would be anarchy and confusion; there could be no government. A moral government must have a moral law for its basis. And such a law God has revealed to his subjects on earth; such a law is referred to in the words of Solomon where he says, "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his command-

ments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Eccl. 12: 13, 14. The ten commandments, spoken by Jehovah with his own voice, and written with his own hand, are a complete moral code, and the only one that has ever been revealed. Indeed, there could not be another; for there can no more be two complete moral codes at the same time than there can be two universal governments contemporaneous, or two supreme beings.

From the words of the wise man we learn that God's law of ten commandments will be the rule in the judgment. We are exhorted to keep his commandments, because he will bring every work into judgment. Then if we keep his commandments, our work will be approved in the judgment; but if we do not keep his commandments, we shall be found sinners, and shall stand condemned. This text refutes Gitchell's oft-repeated opinion, that the system of government revealed to the Jews was one of merely temporal rewards and punishments.

It is true that there was *civil government* among the Jews, as there is now among other nations. But the Jews as well understood the doctrine of future life and future rewards as we do. The resurrection of the dead is as clearly taught in the Old Testament as it is in the New. Solomon teaches a future judgment on the same basis and to the same extent that the New Testament does. He presents the commandments of God as the rule of judgment, when every work and every secret thing shall be judged. So Paul in his epistle to the Romans, says that men shall be judged by the law.

But how about there being no law because there is no penalty? On this point we will introduce a few words from another:—

"The penalty of death, to be inflicted by the magistrate under the former dispensation, was attached to the ten commandments as a part of the *civil* code of the Hebrew nation. The ten commandments were first proclaimed by the voice of God from Sinai, engraved with his own finger on tables of stone, and deposited in the ark in the most holy place of the sanctuary. As such, they constituted a distinct law. Ex. 24:12; Deut. 33:2. They were especially 'God's law,' which all mankind, as subject to the gov-

ernment of God, were bound to obey, and for a violation of which they were answerable at his bar alone. These commands were also incorporated into the civil code of the Jews; and as such, penalties were attached to be inflicted by the magistrate. This penalty doubtless represented the final retribution of the ungodly. When the Jewish polity ceased, these civil penalties, as a part thereof, also ceased. But the real penalty of the law, to be inflicted by the great Lawgiver, has not been set aside. When a man, under the former dispensation, broke the Sabbath, or any other commandment, and was stoned for it, he was punished as an offender against the national constitution, into which these laws were, for the time being, incorporated. But this must not be confounded with the penalty of the law, as it existed independent of that Jewish system. To illustrate: The crime of murder is in some States, at the present time, punishable with death, according to the civil law; but though the criminal may suffer the penalty of this law, he is still answerable for the crime of murder at the bar of God.

"There are three gross absurdities which attach themselves to this position of our opponents, that death under the old dispensation was the full penalty of the law of God. 1. It makes God commit into the hands of men the full penalty of his law, or the punishment of offenses committed against himself! 2. When a person was stoned, he paid the penalty of the law, and in the resurrection, he will be raised, of course, to salvation; for the law has no more claims upon him, he having paid the penalty. 3. If a person, under that dispensation, could elude the vigilance of the magistrate, and, though he had committed crime, was not detected, in the resurrection he also will be raised to salvation; for no law will be found to demand his punishment. And thus the sinner might offend against God, and yet, if he could escape the short-sighted and uncertain vigilance of man, go free! Was God ever thus slack and loose in his system of government? Let those alone believe it, whose position compels them to that absurdity."—*Both Sides*, pp. 38-40.

In his work, Gitchell persists in the blunder of confounding the *civil* penalty of the Jewish commonwealth with the final penalty that God will inflict for the violation of his moral law. He says:—

"In order to evade a destruction to their seventh-day-Sabbath-theory, the Sabbatarians inform us that there were two laws which governed Israel, and the ceremonial law was the one done away in Christ." "'The law and the prophets were until John,' not laws! 'The law came by Moses,' not laws!"

But it is "in order to evade a *destruction* to their seventh-day-Sabbath theory, that Sabbatarians inform us that there were two laws." We admit that very much depends

upon the question here introduced, especially on his side of the argument. Now let us look at this in the light of truth, in order to ascertain who are the guilty ones in this case. Who is it that is trying so hard to evade a ruin of his theory? It is not a matter of so much importance to the candid inquirer for truth as to who informs him, as it is for him to be certain that the information he receives is reliable. Was there one law, or more, that governed Israel? Gitchell says there was only one. Let us see if this is correct.

First we will look over a few passages of Scripture. That the word *law* (single) occurs repeatedly in both the Old and New Testaments, we admit. But Gitchell virtually admits the fact that if the plural of *law* can be found in the Bible, Sabbatarians have gained the question; for he quotes *law*, not *laws*. But we read, "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my *laws*." Gen. 26:5. "Neither will I make the feet of Israel move any more out of the land which I gave their fathers; only if they will observe to do according to all that *I have commanded them*, and according to all the law that *my servant Moses commanded them*." 2 Kings 21:8. "The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws [not law!], changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant." Isa. 24:5.

The above texts of Scripture we regard as sufficient proof that Gitchell is wrong in his position on the one-law system. It would be a rare system of government indeed where one enactment of law would be sufficient to meet every emergency. Thus in our own government we have, first, the fundamental or constitutional law. This is the basis of our government. Then follows another enactment of laws which are absolute in their character, and indispensable, considering the circumstances under which all national governments are now sustained, and that is the military or martial law. Then in regard to our congressional laws; they are as variable as the various minds of those who annually meet in our Congress to frame its laws.

The word *law* is correctly applied not only to the enact-

ments of all legislative bodies, but it is applied to the rules and regulations of our domestic affairs, as to the law of marriage, the rule of the household.

Then, again, by metonymy, it is applied to the mind, to nature, and to the propensity of mankind. In the various applications of the word which so frequently occur in common conversation, no person is ever misled or misunderstood. Gitchell would blush with shame for the person that would blunder in this respect; yet when he comes to the Bible for proof of his position on the law and the Sabbath, he becomes so ardent that he plunges eagerly, defiantly, and exuberantly into the depths of this profound obscurity, and boldly affirms that God's great constitution for the government of this world is in every case referred to wherever the word *law* occurs.

We might here refer the reader to numerous passages of Scripture where the word *law* is used in a broader sense than when especially applied to the ten commandments. Thus in *Eze. 43:12* we find it applied to the form and regulations of the ordinances of God's house. We find the word *law* as used in the Old Testament first applied to the ten commandments as the law of God, and it occurs seventy-one times. Then again we find *laws* (plural) thirteen times.

But Gitchell charges the Sabbatarians with being guilty of resorting to the heretofore-unheard-of two-law theory, in order to avoid the entire destruction of their Sabbath theory. Then if it should so turn out that the Sabbatarians are not the party that have changed in this respect, and always have been, and now are, standing on universally acceptable ground with all Christian denominations, then his unmitigated accusation that Sabbatarians have made this dodge to save their theory from destruction, justly recoils upon his own head.

Buck, in his "Theological Dictionary," gives definitions of the two laws, moral and ceremonial, as already quoted on page 60.

Webster's Dictionary defines each as follows:—

"Moral law; a law which prescribes to men their religious and social duties; in other words, their duties to God and each other. The moral law is summarily contained in the decalogue [or the ten

commandments], written by the finger of God on two tables of stone; and delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai. *Ex. 20.*"

"Ceremonial law; the Mosaic institutions which prescribe the external rites and ceremonies to be observed by the Jews as distinct from the *moral precepts* which are of *perpetual obligation.*" Editions of 1852 and 1854.

Worcester's Dictionary (edition 1860) says:—

"The moral law, the law of God, prescribing personal and social duties and prohibiting transgressions; the law of the ten commandments, in distinction from the ceremonial law."

The Methodist Discipline, art. 6, p. 11, says:—

"Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral."

The following authorities agree with the above:—

"Methodist Episcopal Discipline," art. 6; Free Methodist Discipline," art. 6; "Methodist Protestant Discipline," art. 6; "Wesleyan Methodist Discipline," art. 6, p. 13, ed. of 1880; "Episcopal Book of Common Prayer," art. 7; "Methodist Catechism," No. 2, p. 38; "Baptist Church Manual;" Nevin's "Biblical Antiquities," pp. 224, 225. Also John Wesley, Whitefield, Thomas Dick, Luther, Dr. Scott, Bishop E. Hopkins, Justin Edwards, D.D., Rev. Joseph S. C. F. Frey, Irenæus, Dr. A. Clarke, Thomas Scott, Dr. Albert Barnes, President Humphrey, Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Cumming, Dobney, and Spurgeon.

Eld. E. H. Thomas, in the *Church Advocate*, vol. 26, No. 2, says:—

"The spirit of the decalogue is like its author, unchanged and *unchangeable*, and consequently binding upon *all men* and in *all ages.*"

Tappan, in his "Logic," p. 241, speaking of the great law announced at Sinai, says:—

"Every one of these utters a *universal* and necessary moral truth. Duty as here presented is not arbitrary, but rational."

Calvin and many other prominent Christians have left the same record of their faith. All the above-mentioned

authors speak of the law of ten commandments as being perpetual, in distinction from the ceremonial law, which had subserved its purpose, and, as types and shadows pointing to Christ, had met its antitype in the death of Christ.

Judge J. S. Black, in his reply to Robert Ingersoll, as published in the *North American Review*, in August, 1881, says:—

"The moral code of the Bible consists of certain immutable rules to govern the conduct of all men, at all times and at all places, in their private and personal relations with one another. It is entirely separate and apart from civil polity, the religious forms, the sanitary provisions, the police regulations, and the system of international law laid down for the special and exclusive observance of the Jewish people. This is a distinction which every intelligent man knows how to make. Has Mr. Ingersoll fallen into the egregious blunder of confounding these things?"

The Judge's remarks in the above are comprehensive and significant: "*This is a distinction which every intelligent man knows how to make.*" He then lets him off in a very charitable manner when he closes, by asking if he has fallen into the egregious *blunder* of confounding these things. Ingersoll is not a believer in the divinity of the Bible, and his mission is to ridicule the Bible as best he knows how. The most effectual way of doing this is to take the advantage afforded by the multifarious, heterogeneous, contradictory teachings of those who, while professing to defend, in reality corrupt and mutilate, the doctrines which they profess.

The casual reader will at once discover that there is a vast distinction between the position Gitchell has taken, and that of those good Christian authors whom we have referred to on the two laws and the no-law system. They all make the same distinction between the moral and the ceremonial law that Gitchell accuses Sabbatarians of making "in order to evade a destruction to their seventh-day-Sabbath theory."

Thus we see that the evasion is on his side of the question. We have never changed our position in regard to the immutability and perpetuity of the law of God. We have always believed that the views expressed on this

subject by good men in the past are all right; and knowing, according to the plainest rules of logic, that whatever is affirmed of anything as a whole, is affirmed of all the particulars contained in it; therefore, when we find God's law as a whole brought over into this dispensation, and to be still binding upon the world as the rule by which character is determined (Rom. 3:20), we know that each item of that law is as much binding as though they were individually re-affirmed.

In that law we find a commandment requiring us to keep the Sabbath, and we have accepted it. In that law Gitchell has found the same command, and he has rejected it; and to avoid its claims, he has endeavored to abolish the law itself. Here is where we have parted company, and this is the main issue between us. Years ago, all Protestant Christians occupied common ground in reference to the law of God. But when it was ascertained that our practice did not conform to its requirements, we did not choose to surrender our views of its sanctity and binding obligations to suit our circumstances. The teachings of Christ fully warrant us in holding to this position.

The whole Christian world is of late beginning to awake to the fact, that that law which in times past they have so highly extolled, requires a day of rest different from the one they find themselves observing. By some means or some power another day has been foisted into the place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment of the decalogue. By honest and careful investigation we have learned where it came from, that it originated with the *first great rebel against the government of Heaven, was by him introduced into heathen adoration, then into the corruptions of the papacy, and finally landed in the bosom of all the creeds of Protestantism.* Here it has long been cherished by Christians as heaven-born and legitimate. But its lineage is not of heaven.

Many being aware of this fact, and learning that their practice is not in harmony with the law, have apparently decided the question thus: *We will not change our practice to conform to the requirements of God's law, but we will, at all events, still adhere to our present practice, and*

make the law and our *theory* of the law, even if it involves the abolition of the law, conform to our practice. Gitchell is not alone in this; for many have set themselves to work to accomplish this result. In all their efforts to spread light on the Sabbath question, they invariably fall into the egregious error of confounding the moral law with the ceremonial. They quote Eph. 2:14, 15; Col. 2:14, 16, 17; Heb. 7:18; Acts 15:24; and Gal. 5:4, to show the law abolished. But Rom. 3:31 says: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." Here is another law that is *not* made void, but is *established* through faith in Christ.

In reference to Gal. 5:1-3 and 3:19, 24, it is sufficient to say that Paul does not mean by the word *school-master* the ten commandments. They reveal sin, and show that we are transgressors; but they point out no way of escape, and lead us to no Saviour. What, then, did lead to Christ?—That law, or system, by which the sacrifice of the Saviour was so clearly shadowed forth. Paul is speaking of the same law in the 19th verse; it was added because of transgression, till the seed should come, which seed was Christ.

In order to harmonize these texts of Scripture, one of two things must be proved: either that there are two systems of law entirely distinct from each other, so these expressions do not all refer to the same law; or that, if they do refer to the same law, it must be a law that can be in existence and not in existence at the same time,—a yoke of bondage, and a law of liberty; made void through faith in Christ, and not made void through faith in Christ; established by it, and annulled by it; it must be spiritual and carnal, moral and ceremonial, abolished and not abolished, perfect and imperfect. To prove this latter position it must be shown how Paul could declare it holy, just, and good, then unprofitable, and still take great delight in it after his conversion.

Rev. Clark Braden, a minister and author, and ex-president of one of the Disciple colleges in the West, says, in the *Christian Standard* of Sept. 26, 1874:—

"Others observe the first day, contending without a particle of evidence that the commandment has been changed from the seventh

day to the first. Our preachers are by no means agreed in their teachings. They have no well-defined views on the subject, and are defeated when they attempt a defense of our practice of observing the first day, or a review of the arguments of the advocates of the seventh day. Nor are we alone in this. There is no clear, tenable teaching on this subject in our theological works and commentaries, or by any religious press. Advocates of the observance of the first day *stultify themselves* by taking *contradictory and inconsistent positions*."

Gitchell, on pages 51, 52, quotes Col. 2:14, 16:—

"Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, having spoiled principalities and powers, etc. . . . Let no man therefore judge you in meat or drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moons, or of the Sabbath.' Col. 2:14-19."

Why did he stop here?—Because he was well aware that to quote the remainder would spoil the entire text for his use; for it explains what kind of sabbaths they were: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which *are a shadow* of things to come; but the body is of Christ."

We have already stated that Gitchell's arguments were principally founded upon his own assertions and perverted scripture. The above is no exception. We accept his reading, and his explanation of this text as a fair illustration of his manner of proving things by the Bible.

Now he has proved a point! This will rightly impress the minds of his readers. Now is the time to give the annotation:—

"Ordinance is a demand made by the highest authority. The ordinances here spoken of mean all the Jewish code: ceremonies, statutes, sacrifices, and law. The law of Sinai is the one particularly meant, as it was against them."

But a little explanation is still necessary to make all clear. Without this there may be a possibility that his readers will still adhere to the apostle's explanation. In that case all would prove a failure; for the apostle not only classes these sabbaths (plural) with new moon and feast days of the Jewish ritual, but he says that they were sabbaths that were instituted as shadows of good things to come, but the body is of Christ. Then again, the apostle

classes these days with the handwriting of ordinances which was blotted out and nailed to the cross. These points must be covered up. He continues:—

"Ceremonies and sacrifices they freely entered into in worshipping idols, which they did when they forsook God. But the law put to death the violator, thus embittering and galling them, and was in every sense against them. 'Judge you in respect to the Sabbath days.'"

It will not do to have it thus; for that would serve to divert the reader's mind from the great and important fact that it applied to the seventh-day Sabbath. So he continues:—

"Days' are in italics, put in at the option of the translator; drop it, and all is clear."

Why does Gitchell drop the plural? His own answer is, This makes it all clear. So it does on his side of the question; for "sabbath" would then mean the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. But by what authority does he make this change? It amounts to a bold and daring presumption on his part, for there is no authority for it whatever. The connection proves beyond a shadow of doubt that the plural is correct. The original is also plural, which we will presently show from good authority.

Then why did the apostle speak of them as "days"?—Evidently because he was speaking of a class of sabbaths connected with meats and drinks; they were to be observed annually on the fifteenth and twenty-second days of the first month, on the day of pentecost, and on the first, tenth, fifteenth, and twenty-third days of the seventh month. Lev. 23:24-34. These were "beside the Sabbaths of the Lord." Verse 38. Did God ever utter anything with his own voice concerning meats and drinks in like manner as he proclaimed his Sabbath? Did he write anything about them on tables of stone, where he engraved the commandment for the observance of his rest day?—Not one word. The Sabbath of the Lord belongs entirely to another system, to which the second chapter of Colossians makes no sort of reference whatever. Let us hear what others say about it.

Dr. Albert Barnes says on Col. 2:16:—

"Or in respect of a holy day.' . . . The word rendered 'holy-day'—*ἁγία*—means properly a *feast or festival*; and the allusion here is to the festivals of the Jews. . . . 'Or of the sabbath days.' Greek, 'of the sabbaths.' The word *sabbath* in the Old Testament is applied not only to the seventh day, but to all the days of holy rest that were observed by the Hebrews, and particularly to the beginning and close of their great festivals. There is, doubtless, reference to those days in this place, as the word is used in the plural number. . . . There is not the slightest reason to believe that he meant to teach that one of the ten commandments has ceased to be binding on mankind. If he had used the word in the singular number,—'*THE Sabbath*,'—it would then, of course, have been clear that he meant to teach that that commandment had ceased to be binding, and that a Sabbath was no longer to be observed. But the use of the term in the plural number, and the connection, show that he had his eye on the great number of days which were observed by the Hebrews as festivals, as a part of their ceremonial and typical law, and not to the *moral* law, or the ten commandments. No part of the moral law—no one of the ten commandments—could be spoken of as '*a shadow* of good things to come.' These commandments are, from the nature of moral law, of perpetual and universal obligation."

The "New Testament with Notes," by the American Tract Society, says:—

"Judge you; pronounce you good or bad, according to your treatment of the ceremonial law. A holy-day—sabbath days: in the original, a festival sabbath. The days referred to are those required to be observed in the ceremonial law, days associated by God with meats, drinks, and new moons. . . . The weekly Sabbath was never against men or contrary to them, but was always for them, and promotive of their highest good. The observance of it caused them to ride upon the high places of the earth, and to possess the heritage of God's people. Isa. 58:13, 14; Jer. 17:21-27."

Dr. Adam Clarke gives the same annotation. In it he says:—

"There is no intimation here that the *Sabbath* was done away, or that its moral use was superseded, by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere that, 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy,' is a command of perpetual obligation, and can never be superseded but by the final termination of time."

But we are not ready to dismiss Gitchell from this text yet. He says the ordinances here spoken of "mean all the Jewish code: ceremonies, statutes, sacrifices, and law. The law of Sinai is the one particularly meant, as it was

against them." To make this assumption appear plausible, he then asserts that ceremonies were freely practiced in worshipping idols, when they had forsaken the worship of God. But the law put to death the violators, thus embittering and galling them, and was in every sense against them. His argument stands thus: 1. The law of Sinai is the one particularly meant, as it was against them. 2. The ceremonies and sacrifices they freely entered into in worshipping idols. They were naturally inclined to this, hence in no sense was it against them. 3. The law put to death the violator, and was in every sense against them. But this idea neither follows from the premises, nor is favored by the text. Furthermore, the reason assigned for it will not stand the test when applied to any law, and even less when applied to the ten commandments.

"Ye shall therefore keep my statutes, and my judgments: which if a man do, he shall live in them." This proves that they are not in every sense against them: but Gitchell says that this law put to death the violator. It was the *penalty* of the law which thus embittered and galled them. Gitchell says that this penalty is found in the ceremonial part of the law. So the ten commandments alone do not amount to a law, and of necessity require the attachment of the ceremonial law, which contains the penalty. Here he twice affirms that the ceremonial part of the law contained the penalty. But this is the identical part that was against them, contrary to them, taken out of the way, and nailed to the cross. Thus by applying Gitchell's statements as we find them on p. 54, we have disproved his conclusions on p. 52.

Stultification, No. 2.

We turn to p. 50, and find him referring to the law thus:—

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to any graven image, or likeness of anything, nor serve them, for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.' Man's own nature teaches him that it is an insult to his intelligence to bow down and worship anything having neither life nor mind; also that homage and adoration belong alone to our Creator, and that his name should be revered and kept sacred, used only when petitioning, or in devo-

tional worship. These three commands, we find, are natural law, designating the relation that should exist and be practiced by every creature of intelligence, toward his Creator."

Here he says that "man's *own nature* teaches him that it is an insult to his intelligence" to disregard either of the first three commandments. He passes the fourth command, and repeats the other six in substance, and his comments upon them are appropriate and vehement. And he adds:—

"No man can trample down these principles without doing violence to his intuitive knowledge of right and wrong, and degrading his intelligence. These six moral principles are also natural law, determining the relation existing between man and man."

He then continues his remarks as follows (pp. 50, 51):—

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' This is not founded upon natural law, for there is nothing in keeping one day above another that addresses itself to the intelligence. No innate perception calls for anything of the kind; therefore, the Sabbath must of necessity be a direct command. In the absence of this command, a keeping of every day alike would not introduce the slightest perception in any mind that they were disturbing the feelings or injuring the interest of God, angel, or man. But the breaking of either the other nine discovers a wrong and shocks our intuitive principles.

"Thus tersely rehearsing the ten commandments, I am not afraid to appeal to the candid for a decision that the fourth commandment is not natural law, and therefore can be laid aside at the option of the commander, and man would say, Amen. But let Jehovah send a person . . . to do violence to either of the nine commands, and the intelligent will not sanction it."

Notice, he says, "No man can trample down these principles *without doing violence* to his *intuitive knowledge* of right and wrong, and degrading his *intelligence*." "The breaking of either the other nine discovers a wrong and shocks our intuitive principles." Then accordingly none of the other nine precepts of the decalogue can in any sense be considered as against either *natural* or *intelligent* men.

Then he introduces Col. 2:16 to show that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was abolished at the cross; but he discovers that the Sabbath is so firmly

connected with the law (being proclaimed by God from Sinai) that he turns his battery against the *whole code* of commandments, and *squarely contradicts* what he has repeatedly affirmed on pages 50, 51, to be true of nine of the commandments, by boldly asserting that they were in *every sense* against the violator.

Stultification, No. 3.

On pages 55, 56, he says:—

"The law governing the Jewish nation was a law of works, and unless adhered to, death was the result. The law governing the Christian is the law of love planted in his heart, and when unpracticed the covenant is broken, and the person stands condemned before God."

Which is the more fearful result? The first was in *every sense* against them, because it condemned the violator; the second is the law of love, but God condemns those who do not practice it. The first was a law of works which must be strictly adhered to, or death was the result, and on that account it was taken out of the way; the second requires the same number and the same kind of works, not even excepting the Sabbath, only observing it on another day, and on this account it is a better law than the first, and if not adhered to and practiced, eternal ruin will be the result. The first was weak and unprofitable, and for this reason it was disannulled; the second contains all the principles of the first. Yet the first, with all its appendages, is done away!

Our great trouble, Gitchell says, is this:—

"They know that the seventh-day Sabbath goes forever, unless they can prove that Christ chose the old Sabbath as the Sabbath for the Christian dispensation, which they know is impossible."

We were not aware that it had become necessary for a law to be re-enacted in order to perpetuate the duty it enjoins, while no law or commandment is needful in order to establish and enforce a new institution. Will Gitchell inform us how it is that we are under stronger obligation to do what God has *not* enjoined than to do what he *has* enjoined? Will he inform us how it has become more sinful to neglect what God has *not* commanded than to

disobey what he *has* commanded? God commands that men shall work on the first day; Gitchell claims that to do so is sin. God commands that on the seventh day men shall not work; Gitchell teaches that men may work on it. Thus he sets up his authority against God's, and claims that God is pleased and glorified thereby! "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 John 2:4.

All those scriptures in the New Testament which prove that the law of ten commandments is binding as a whole, prove the Sabbath to be in force. When Christ says he came not to destroy the law, we can rightly say he did not come to destroy the Sabbath, which is a part of that law. When he says that not one jot or tittle of the law shall pass till heaven and earth pass, he makes the Sabbath binding, at least throughout this dispensation. When he says unqualifiedly, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," he makes the keeping of the Sabbath a part of that condition.

When Paul says, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law" (Rom. 3:31), we affirm that the Sabbath is not made void, but established, through faith. When he concludes that the law "is holy, and just, and good" (Rom. 7:12), we conclude the same of the fourth commandment. When he says, "I delight in the law of God" (verse 22), it is certain that he delighted in the Sabbath of that law. When Paul, thirty years after the resurrection of Christ, declared publicly, before his enemies, that he had done nothing against the law of the Jews or the customs of their fathers (Acts 25:8; 28:17), we say that this could not have been true if he had taught by word or deed that the seventh-day Sabbath had lost any of its former sacredness, or that any other day had superseded it or ever should.

When the beloved apostle defines sin as "the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4), we scripturally and logically assert that it is sin to transgress the fourth commandment. Again, when he says, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments" (1 John 5:3),

we believe that we show our love to God by keeping the Sabbath. When, of the law that says, "Do not commit adultery," "Do not kill," James writes, "So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty" (James 2: 11, 12), we infer that we shall meet the Sabbath in the judgment.

But Gitchell claims that the Sabbath commandment is not founded upon natural law, and must of necessity be a direct command. We answer: Even admitting that the Sabbath depends entirely on the will of the Lawgiver, it remains to be proved that that will has abolished it. But if there is one precept above another which is moral, and grows out of the nature of things, it is the Sabbath precept, which is written on the very front of nature. This is the only precept of the ten which tells us how nature came into existence, and points us from nature to nature's God. Without the facts on which it is based, we could not distinguish the God who gave the law of ten commandments from other gods, and his law would have no force. It grows out of man's moral, mental, and physical wants. It is emphatically the precept of gratitude and love, and lies at the foundation of and enforces all moral law. It unfolds to our minds the great fact that we owe our existence and all our blessings to God, who made our fellow-creatures as well as ourselves; and this fact involves an obligation to love God supremely, and our neighbor as ourselves. If we do this, we shall have no other gods before the true God, make no idols to worship them, use the name of God with reverence, and keep his rest day, and shall honor our parents, and pay a strict regard to the life, chastity, property, reputation, and interests of our fellow-men,—in fact, we shall keep all the commandments. Thus the Sabbath is the golden link that unites man to his Creator, man to his fellow-men, and the moral duties we owe to God to those we owe to our fellow-men. It is the key that opens the way to all our moral duties. If it is morally right to give our fellow-creatures their due, it is morally right to give God his due, and the day he claims as his own.

Gitchell, on page 49, says:—

"The effort to fabricate something because the New Testament writers use the word *Sabbath* in speaking of the old Jewish rest day, is certainly very weak."

There is no variance among the inspired writers of either the Old Testament or the New, in respect to the Sabbath. Not less than eighty-four religious meetings are distinctly recorded in the New Testament as being held on the Sabbath. The church at Corinth had learned their Christian faith from Paul, and by hearing him preach "every Sabbath." Acts 18: 4. Forty-nine times the inspired writers of the New Testament have applied the sacred title of Sabbath to the seventh day, and yet with Gitchell it only amounts to a very weak fabrication to suppose that here is the least evidence that the Sabbath was brought over into this dispensation, or was observed by the Christian church. But will Gitchell please inform us why these inspired writers continue to call the seventh day the Sabbath? Were they not Christian ministers? If the first day had become the Christian Sabbath, and the former Sabbath had been abolished, would they continue to call it *the Sabbath*? Could they say of anything that happened on that day, that it occurred on the Sabbath, when the Sabbath was done away, and Christ had chosen another day to be observed under the Christian covenant? We see at once that such language could neither be in harmony with strict principles of honesty, nor with their character as Christian ministers. Such expressions can never be accounted for on any other ground than that the seventh day was still to be observed as the Sabbath. Acts 20: 7-12 contains a record of one religious meeting held on the first day of the week, and that was a night meeting. How can Gitchell prove apostolic custom from a single meeting? Does it not look as though the attempt to fabricate something was on his side of the question? Certainly the facts in the case cause his accusations against Sabbath-keepers to recoil severely upon his own head, and place him—

Against the Bible, No. 13.

"It is time for thee, Lord, to work; for they have made void thy law." Ps. 119: 126.

Gitchell says, page 53:—

"What about the 19th Psalm, 7th v., which reads: 'The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul'? The marginal note in your Bible changes materially the present translation, and is a correct rendering of the Hebrew. It reads thus: 'The doctrine of the Lord is perfect, restoring the soul.'"

David gives a decisive testimony, and a very direct one. He says: "The law of the Lord is perfect." But Gitchell cannot afford to have it that way, and so seeks to evade it by quoting the marginal reading. But does it change the present translation materially as he has stated? Is there any discrepancy between the *law* of the Lord and the *doctrine* of the Lord? If indeed there *is* the difference which he intimates, why did he not point it out, so his readers could understand it? Was he not capable of it? Did not the circumstances of the case require it? All will agree, certainly, that if the marginal reading changes the meaning of the text so materially as entirely to remove the idea conveyed in regard to the perfection of God's law, and to place it upon something different and something better, according to Gitchell's opinion, it would be very important to understand the matter. We can easily discover that he intended to remove the statement from the *law*, and thus degrade it, and befog the mind of the reader in regard to its perfection. Yes, we readily discover that very much now depends upon a correct understanding of this text; for if the law was *perfect*, as the text declares, then God could not abolish or change even a jot or tittle, without marring his own work. A perfect law cannot be changed and still remain perfect. No language has ever yet been capable of conveying the idea that anything can become more than *perfect*.

Gitchell, apparently being aware of this fact, could not pass this text without an effort to get it out of his way. How much he has gained by this depends upon how far he has succeeded in removing it. This may be fairly determined by a careful examination of the facts in the premises. In the first place, admitting the marginal reading to be correct, it still remains to be shown that it changes the present translation. In other words, would not a perfect law constitute a perfect doctrine? Is not

law a rule of action? Is it not the embodiment of doctrine? Doctrine implies both principle and precept. All law contains principle and precept either perfect or imperfect. Then the premises in the case, briefly summed up, are, 1. The *doctrine* of the Lord is *perfect*; 2. The *law* of the Lord is *perfect*.

But admitting that Gitchell is correct in making the distinction that he does in regard to law and doctrine, it could not be decided in his favor until he brought proof that the marginal reading is the true rendering of the text. This he did not attempt to do, hence in point of argument, as usual, he has only made the assertion that the marginal reading is an improvement on the present translation. It would have been in keeping with modesty and fair argument, to say the least, to have either referred to other portions of Scripture, or to some reliable commentary. But such fairness on his part cannot be afforded, or even expected. He has undertaken a task that no man living is able to accomplish by straight proof or fair argument. That he relied on perverting the text as his only chance of saving his theory from entire destruction, will appear when we read the connection in which the verse he quotes is found: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever: the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned; and in keeping of them there is great reward."

The whole context shows that it is *the law* of which he is speaking. And the original word *theléma*, (see definition on page 58), is the word from which *law* is usually translated. It is found in such texts as Ex. 12: 49; 16: 4; 24: 12; Ps. 89: 30, in every occurrence of the word *law* in Ps. 119, and in other places too numerous to mention.

Gitchell quotes Rom. 3: 28, 20: "Therefore we con-

clude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." See also Gal. 2: 16; Rom. 10: 4; 6: 14.

We will again state that we are not seeking justification by the law, nor are we presumptuous enough to claim justification through the merits of Christ while living in willful violation of the duties enjoined in the ten commandments. But what was Gitchell's object in quoting these texts? Did he intend to make it appear to his readers that the Christian is released through faith from performing the duties enjoined in the ten commandments? If so he is certainly guilty of advocating a system of morality that is rotten from center to circumference. And if he does not mean this, he attempts to deceive.

"Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. 10: 4. If this means that the believer is released from obligation to obey the duties enjoined in the ten commandments, it follows that Christ's mission was to secure to his followers the privilege of Sabbath-breaking, profanity, adultery, theft, lying, murder, etc., with the approval of God, who will say, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." But since this privilege is limited to the believer, it follows that he is not the end of the law to the unbeliever; therefore they are obliged to be moral and keep God's law, Sabbath and all. But what does John mean when he says, "This is the *love* of God that we keep his commandments"? Is it not equivalent to saying, This is enmity against God that we disobey his commandments, or desire to do so? The carnal mind is said to be enmity against God, because it is not subject to the law of God. This should be sufficient condemnation of Gitchell's theory; and more especially so, when we hear the apostle saying that he delighted in the law of God after the renewed man, and that the righteousness of the law is fulfilled by those who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.

But we will not leave it here. The expression, "for righteousness," shows in what sense Christ is the end

of the law to the believer: The law spoken of is the standard of righteousness, or that which is designed to secure righteousness; we in our lives have come short of that righteousness; therefore Christ came in to fill up the lack, in other words, to accomplish in the believer the purpose of the law, which was to secure to him perfect righteousness or holiness. Thus we can see why it is that Christ's being the end of the law affects only believers. They are the ones who come to Christ for pardon of sins, or past transgressions of God's law; hence it is to them only that he becomes the end, object, or design of the law, by imputing to them his own righteousness.

If Gitchell had looked up the meaning of the word *end* here, in the Greek, he would have found Greenfield giving its meaning as follows: "End, scope, object, principal point, the sum of anything." The original absolutely forbids the idea, as intimated by Gitchell, that Christ put an end to the law.

There are several instances of a like use of the word in the Bible: "For to this end also did I write." 2 Cor. 2: 9. "Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." 1 Tim. 1: 5. "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation." Heb. 13: 7. "Behold, we count them happy which endure. Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord." James 5: 11. "For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." Rom. 14: 9. "Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born." John 18: 37.

The above examples of the use of the term in a different sense from what Gitchell construes its meaning, are another evidence that he has undertaken to prove something which has no foundation, and cannot be sustained by the Scriptures. If indeed there is good evidence, as he claims, that the moral law has served its full purpose in the former dispensation, why does he keep it back, and

continue to quote texts of Scripture that so plainly apply to something else? In speaking of the Sabbath he says (p. 47):—

"It was closed up; Christ laid in the grave, and threw a dark pall over it. He was never known afterwards to keep it."

Why does he not speak as emphatically on this point, and tell us plainly that when Christ put an end to his Father's law he was never afterward known to promulgate it, or even pronounce a blessing on those who kept it? Perhaps Gitchell is aware that in the year A. D. 96, about 63 years after Christ's death, he revealed the following important truth to his servant John: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." This is sufficient for us. A better motive could not be presented to us for keeping God's law of ten commandments. And as Gitchell argues that the law and the Sabbath go together (in company), we sincerely conclude to observe the Sabbath, and thus obey *all* the commandments of God, and keep our hands from doing any evil.

"The only bright spot the Sabbatharians present for the seventh-day Sabbath," says Gitchell, "is its commemoration of creation; and this without a foundation in the word of God." This, according to his view, makes it all very dark indeed; for if that bright spot has no foundation, then all is inconsistent and inexplicable. Hence no Sabbatharian is supposed to be able to present anything that will shed the least ray of light on their side of the question. This being the case, we will first pass it over to Gitchell. He has been so thorough in his elaborations that if it is omitted in his writings, we can have very little hope of finding it elsewhere; while if it is clearly and plainly stated in his writings, we may look with confidence in the Scriptures, expecting to find it there!

We now turn to page 56 of his book, and read as follows:—

"When the Jews took delight in their Sabbath, all idolatry was discarded, and a life of devotion was practiced. With such a life God was well pleased, and he protected them, and universally they prospered under the continued blessings of their Creator."

This looks a little brighter for us than what he said on page 47, where all was surrounded with terror, and stones, and slavery, and fire, and death! Certainly we ought to feel very grateful to him for helping us out thus far; it looks like emerging from total darkness into the clear light. Now we can look into the Scriptures, expecting to find some light there.

When the prophet Isaiah looks beyond this present evil world, paralyzed and blackened with death, when he looks forward to a new earth reposing in beauty and loveliness under the new heaven, he gives us a clear view of God's holy Sabbath in that glorious and eternal state: "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon [or month] to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Isa. 66: 22, 23. Thus while the Sabbath was placed as a bright memorial of the first creation, and has been the sign between God and his loyal people throughout the period of their pilgrimage, in paradise restored it again appears conspicuous among the blessings of the great restitution; and God through his prophet points to it as a season of repose and worship for the saints of God forever and ever. Here is something besides terror, stones, slavery, fire, and death brought to view in connection with the Sabbath.

But how is it in the present state? "Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment, and do justice; for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil. Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord hath utterly separated me from his people: neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I am a dry tree. For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my Sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant; even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I

will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off. Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant: even them will I bring to my holy mountain [or kingdom], and make them joyful in my house of prayer." Isa. 56: 1-7.

Here is something connected with keeping the Sabbath which is not surrounded with terror, stones, slavery, fire, and death: here is something lovely, inspiring, and cheering to the Christian, Gitchell to the contrary notwithstanding. And the above scriptures promise eternal happiness to all who will take hold of God's covenant and keep the Sabbath from polluting it, and keep from doing any evil.

This scripture has its application unmistakably under the new covenant. Gitchell will agree with us here; for he says on page 15, that the old covenant promised heaven and eternal happiness to no one. So if he be right, the blessings herein promised to those who keep the Sabbath are to those who observe it under the new covenant. Then taking Gitchell's word with the Bible, we learn that God will bless any one who will now keep the Sabbath, and this is the seventh-day Sabbath, and not the first day; for Gitchell emphatically states (p. 55) that the Christian Sabbath—that of the New Testament, and of the early history of the Church of Christ—was ever known by the term *Lord's day* and *first day of the week*.

We have before shown that the above scripture applies down in the time when eternal salvation is near; "for my salvation is near to come." Salvation will come at the second appearing of Christ.

Proof: "I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." John 14: 3. "When Christ, who is *our life*, shall appear, *then* shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. 3: 4. The saints "are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation *ready to be revealed* in the *last time*." 1 Peter 1: 5. "Unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Heb. 9: 27.

From this testimony we believe that God is now calling on all to lay hold of his covenant, and keep the Sabbath. ¶ Before coming directly to the question, Who changed the Sabbath? let us consider the result of such a change. The law of God is embraced in the ten commandments; this law the psalmist says "is perfect," — not a precept too many, not one too few, but as the wise man shows, it contains the "whole duty of man." God himself has also revealed it to us as holy. To change any of the ten parts of this law is to change the law itself, and render it imperfect. To illustrate: You have a rule twelve inches in length. Not one of those inches can be spared without marring the rule. So if the fourth commandment be changed, there is of necessity a change of the law. Such a change has been attempted, and, as our proposition states, contrary to divine will.

In the prophecy of Daniel we have the remarkable prediction that an attempt would be made to change the law of God. This is the *only* testimony in all the Bible that speaks of a change. The only change, then, that will ever be made in God's law, will be in fulfillment of this prediction.

In the seventh chapter of Daniel a chain of prophecy is introduced bringing to view four universal kingdoms, symbolized by wild beasts. As to the application of these symbols, the prophecy itself explains them so clearly as to leave no doubt: "Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth." Verse 23. "And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings [or kingdoms] that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings." Verse 24.

Those who will carefully study Daniel's prophecy of the four great kingdoms, and compare them with the history of the Eastern world since it was given, can see how exactly it has been fulfilled. The second, third, and fourth kingdoms arose precisely as predicted, and each one in turn fulfilled precisely the specifications given concerning it. The fourth kingdom was divided into ten parts, or kingdoms, as predicted, between the years A. D. 356 and 483.

The 24th verse brings to view another power which was to arise after the ten, diverse from them, and the prophet said he should subdue three kings. It is a fact susceptible of proof that the papacy arose, as the prophet says, *after* the ten horns, or kingdoms, the Heruli, Vandals, and Ostrogoths being in succession removed out of the way. The last of these powers was subdued in A. D. 538, at which time the papacy gained its supremacy.

In the following words the prophet tells us what this power would do: "And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time." Dan. 7: 25. This is a remarkable prophecy; please notice the following points:—

1. "He shall speak great words against the Most High." For a fulfillment of this prediction, look at the titles of the pope of Rome: "His Holiness," "Vicegerent of the Son of God," "King of the World," "Another God upon Earth," etc. He also claims the power to forgive sins before they are committed.

2. He "shall wear out the saints of the Most High." What an army will come up in the resurrection as witnesses to this terrible fact! From fifty to one hundred millions of the saints of God, it is said, have met their death at the hands of this cruel power. These points so clearly identify papal Rome that there is no disputing it.

3. He shall "think to change times and laws." Three acts are ascribed to this power; and the first two he shall perform, but the third he shall only "*think*" to do, or, as the Douay Bible renders it, "shall think himself able to change," etc. The word *laws* in the Hebrew was in the singular, "the *law*." This, of course, is the law of the Most High. How unnatural to read the text thus: He shall speak great words against the Most High, wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws of *men*! But how natural is the following: He shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and the law of the Most High! As to human laws, the papacy has changed them at his will, but the law in question he will only *think* to change.

Before going further with this point, we will introduce another that has a direct bearing right here. It is this: The law of God is not susceptible to change. This we have already shown; but will give a few texts of Scripture to prove that it never can be changed. This law is God's great rule of righteousness, and by it he is to judge the world. Says David, "Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth." "My tongue shall speak of thy word; for all thy commandments are righteousness." Ps. 119: 142, 172. These statements show, first, that God's commandments are his righteousness; and, secondly, that his righteousness is everlasting. They are equivalent to saying that the commandments are everlasting. Paul declares that "as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law." Rom. 2: 12. James says, "So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." James 2: 12. These texts prove what we have just stated, that God will judge the world by his law. Says David, "The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure." Ps. 111: 7. Were we to inquire *how* sure, the answer would be found in the next verse: "They stand fast forever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness." Listen again; the Son of God says: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all [not all the law, but all things, *Greek Testament*] be fulfilled." Matt. 5: 17, 18.

Upon that reckless view which makes the expression *to fulfill* mean "to abolish," or "to do away with," we simply remark that the meaning of *destroy* is directly opposite to that of *fulfill*; for he says he came not to do the one, but to do the other. If *fulfill* means "to do away," then *destroy* means "to keep;" because they are opposite; and men may take whichever horn of the dilemma they please. But what follows these expressions shows conclusively that the Saviour had no such idea in view as the abolition of the law: "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no

wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." The heavens and the earth still remain, and the Saviour's words being true, *every jot and tittle of the law is in force to-day.*

These testimonies from Christ, David, Paul, and James, very clearly prove that God never designed to have a change made in his law. Such expressions as are found in the foregoing scriptures must have weight with the candid mind in examining this question.

Let us now return to the prophecy of an attempted change of God's law, which has been introduced. "He shall *think* to change times and laws." Dan. 7: 25. This is one of the three acts attributed to this power, and now we inquire, Has the power symbolized by the little horn of Dan. 7: 25, the papacy, fulfilled the prophecy? All must admit that so far as the first two acts are concerned he has fulfilled them to the letter, and in admitting this, they also admit either that he has fulfilled the third act, or that the prophecy has failed. But to this last conclusion the lover of God's word can never come. We say, then, that the papacy has taken hold of the law, and attempted to reconstruct it. In plain language, Rome has changed the Sabbath.

The reader will please notice that the prophecy indicates a change in that part of the law referring to "time." This clearly identifies the fourth commandment, for it is the only one in which time is mentioned. God made the sun to rule the day, placing it in the heavens as his great time-keeper; and when its setting rays fall upon the earth, they say to man that the day is just closing. This fact, that the day ends at the setting of the sun, is clearly set forth in the Bible. We will simply refer the reader to a few passages: Gen. 1: 5; Lev. 23: 32; Deut. 16: 6; Mark 1: 32. The Roman power has changed this order for a very unnatural one, that of beginning the day at midnight; and to-day, as every one knows, we are living under Roman time.

Not satisfied with this, the papacy takes hold of the fourth commandment, and tears from it the rest day of Jehovah, inserting in its stead the pagan "sun's day;" hence the term *Sunday*. Rome is the guilty party in this transaction. We accuse her of this act, and we will now

call upon her to take the stand and give her testimony. Does she plead "not guilty" to the charge?—Nay, verily. We quote from standard Catholic authorities:—

"*Ques.* Why was the Jewish Sabbath changed into the Sunday?"

"*Ans.* Because Christ was born upon a Sunday, rose from the dead upon a Sunday, and sent down the Holy Ghost upon a Sunday: works not inferior to the creation of the world.

"*Q.* By whom was it changed?"

"*A.* By the governors of the church."

"*Q.* How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?"

"*A.* By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church."—*Abridgement of Christian Doctrine*, p. 58.

"*Q.* What warrant have you for keeping Sunday preferably to the ancient Sabbath, which was the Saturday?"

"We have for it the authority of the Catholic Church and apostolical tradition."—*Catholic Christian Instructed*, p. 202.

The following statements were made by a Catholic priest in the opera house in Hartford, Kansas, Feb. 18, 1884, as reported in the *Hartford Weekly Call* of Feb. 22. On this Sunday question he spoke as follows:—

"Christ gave to the church the power to make laws binding upon the conscience. Show me one sect that claims or possesses the power to do so, save the Catholic Church. There is none, and yet all Christendom acknowledges the power of the church to do so, as I will prove to you. For example, the observance of Sunday. How can other denominations keep this day? The Bible commands you to keep the Sabbath day. Sunday is not the Sabbath day; no man dare assert that it is; for the Bible says as plainly as words can make it that the seventh day is the Sabbath, *i. e.*, Saturday; for we know Sunday to be the first day of the week. Besides, the Jews have been keeping the Sabbath unto the present day. I am not a rich man, but I will give \$1,000 to any man who will prove by the Bible alone that Sunday is the day we are bound to keep. No; it cannot be done, it is impossible. The observance of Sunday is solely a law of the Catholic Church, and therefore is not binding upon others. The church changed the Sabbath to Sunday, and all the world bows down and worships upon that day, in silent obedience to the mandates of the Catholic Church. Is this not a living miracle—that those who hate us so bitterly obey and acknowledge our power every week, and do not know it?"

"Here are they that keep the commandments of God." Rev. 14: 12. This is an acknowledged characteristic of a class of people living in the time when the warning is given, "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God." Rev. 14: 9, 10. The cause for this warning is shown by Rev. 13: 11, 12: "And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb [Republicanism and Protestantism], and he spake as a dragon.* And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed." It is evident that the beast here referred to as the first beast is a symbol of the papal church, the same power that Daniel saw represented by the little horn; and of which he says, "He shall think to change times and laws." Dan. 7: 25. As we have before shown, the papacy has thought to change the law and times of God, and has so far succeeded that now almost the whole world worships upon the day that church has selected, as they themselves claim, instead of upon the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

But the reader may inquire, What has all this to do with the worship of the beast? Paul says, "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey?" Now mark carefully; God says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." The papal church says, Sunday is the Lord's day, instead of the Sabbath, which was the Saturday. Now if I keep Sunday, whose servant am I? You must answer, The servant of the papal church. Well, if you keep Saturday, the seventh day, whose servant are you?—The servant of him whom you obey, that is, God; because he commanded you to do so. Ex. 20: 8-11: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath," etc.

* See "Marvel of Nations," p. 135, published at the Review and Herald Office, Battle Creek, Mich.

Now mark the expressions of Catholics on this question: "The church changed the Sabbath to Sunday, and all the world bows down and worships upon that day, in silent obedience to the mandates of the Catholic Church. Is this not a living miracle—that those who hate us so bitterly obey and acknowledge our power every week, and *do not know it?*"

Now, dear reader, who will constitute the worshipers of the beast? Your answer must be, "All who make a final choice to keep Sunday instead of the Sabbath;" and it is in harmony with the word of God. See Rev. 13: 3. You see, then, how the beast is worshiped. The ministers of the popular churches are nearly all preaching that Sunday is the Sabbath, or Lord's day. Sunday-school teachers are all teaching the same; and the result is, people are keeping Sunday instead of the Sabbath, with no authority for it whatever, except the Catholic Church; for there is no authority in the Bible, neither is there left on record an apostolic example for its observance.

Here, then, is the time for the warning of the third angel, "If any man worship the beast, . . . the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God." This will be true only after the angel has given the warning, and men have deliberately and knowingly decided to worship the beast, and receive his mark, which the beast with two horns like a lamb shall enforce, as the dragon-beast formerly enforced the pagan sun's day. The angel closes his warning by saying, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God;" and one of these commandments says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." The manner in which the angel here introduces the commandments of God, shows that they are the only safeguard against the reception of the mark of the beast.

We now invite the reader to stop a moment, and review the ground over which we have passed.

1. The prophecy declares that some power would arise, and attempt to change the law. It also clearly identifies Rome as the power in question. We lay the charge at her feet, and she confesses the crime, though to her it is not a crime, but a mark of her power. What further testimony do we need? A man supposed to be guilty of

murder is accused, brought to trial, and confesses his guilt; all are then satisfied, because they have the highest kind of evidence. So in the case before us; Rome declares she has done it, affirming that it shows her power to legislate in church matters.

2. We have found, further, that the saints, times, and laws were to be given into the hands of this power until the time of the end, or, as we have seen, till 1798.

3. The hedge around the people of God is his law. Eze. 13: 5; 22: 26, 30.

4. A breach has been made in this hedge, which is an attempt to change God's holy day; for this is the only change which has been attempted in the law. But in the last days this breach in the hedge must be made up, or mended, so that God's people can stand in the day of the Lord.

5. This work will be done by those who "call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable," etc.

It has not been our purpose to show that we are now in the last days. An examination of God's word, comparing it with the signs of the times in the physical, political, and moral world, will convince the candid that this is true.

Then the time has come for a *Sabbath reform*, predicted by prophets centuries ago. Already it is being accomplished in accordance with those prophecies, and its influence is being widely felt. The Sabbath question has been thoroughly agitated in the United States, and has spread from here to Canada, England, Germany, Switzerland, France, Italy, Russia, Norway, Sweden, Roumania, Australia, New Zealand, and some of the smaller islands of the Pacific. There are six large publishing houses devoted almost entirely to the dissemination of literature on this question, sending out twenty-three periodicals in the English, German, French, Italian, Danish, Swedish, and Roumanian languages, besides tracts, pamphlets, and bound books by the million. The Central Publishing House alone has sent out 481,718,747 pages of reading matter. Seventh-day Adventists have now thirty organized conferences, and 889 churches, with a membership of 25,841. The yearly tithe amounts to nearly \$200,000.

Opponents are on hand, however, from among those who hide their eyes from the Sabbath, to make the people hope that they will confirm the word (Eze. 13: 6) that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath. But notwithstanding this, thousands are turning from the "traditions of men" to the keeping of God's holy Sabbath. The printed truth is being scattered like the leaves of autumn. All are being invited to take their feet from the Sabbath, and call it "a delight." Isa. 58: 13, 14. Men have had their feet on the Sabbath, not purposely nor willingly, but ignorantly, not being aware of the fact that it was the Sabbath. God has accepted them because they have walked in the light they had. In his providence, God has given us greater light, and we will be accepted, as were our fathers, only by walking in all the light that beams upon our pathway.

May this be the lot of both reader and writer; and when the Just One shall come, may we be found among those who keep the commandments of God, that we may have right to the tree of life, and a safe entrance through the gates into the city. Rev. 22: 14.

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

WE quote again from Gitchell (p. 31):—

"The human race, from Adam down four thousand years, looked for a transaction to be brought about by God himself, on which the hopes of eternal life and an endless happiness should be secured. And this event was everything to them, in time or eternity, and the only transaction that could fully satisfy the nations and people of earth to commemorate during their probationary state, or even to commemorate during eternal ages.

"Since this astonishing event, the Christian world has recognized the day of its completion as her weekly celebration, and will continue its use at least till the winding up of human probation. Nothing has taken place since the fall of man, or will take place in time, or at the resurrection, the judgment day, or the glorious entrance into the kingdom of God, that could elicit for a moment our attention, so worthy of commemoration as the Lord's day; for every honored position or enjoyment tendered to us in the annals of eternity are suspended upon the event we now commemorate."

In the above our author assumes that redemption was completed, or finished, when Christ rose from the dead. But this is a plain contradiction of fact. Redemption was not finished when Christ rose from the dead. We have the Saviour's own words for this, as recorded by Luke, chapter 21: 28: "And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; [for what?] for your *redemption* draweth nigh." Redemption includes the resurrection of the dead, and the immortality of all the saints, and a world made new. It will not be finished until the end of probation, when sin is no more. But even if it were a fact that redemption was then finished, it would not prove that creation should not be commemorated as God has ordained; nor would it prove the first day or any other day to be holy without a divine appointment and a sanctifying act, setting it apart to a holy use, as the seventh day was set apart. God's resting on the seventh day was not what made it a holy day, for it was *after* he *had* rested that he sanctified it, and made it a holy day. Redemption is nowhere in the Scriptures attributed to the resurrection of Christ, but to his death and blood. Rev. 5: 9; Eph. 1: 17; Col. 1: 14. Do the Scriptures of truth teach falsehood?

Here we find Gitchell against the Bible, No. 14.

But he continues:—

"Since this astonishing event, the Christian world has recognized the day of its completion as her weekly celebration," etc.

If the work of Christ in man's redemption is so worthy of our commemoration, why does he not call our attention to something respecting it in the New Testament? We claim that he does. 1 Cor. 11: 23-26: "The Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." Here is a divinely authorized memorial of redemption; and in the following passage is a divinely au-

thorized memorial of Christ's resurrection: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection."

These are Christ's own institutions; no man dare say they are not. Then if Gitchell succeeds in finding that the first day of the week is a memorial of Christ's resurrection, he will have a *second* memorial of the same event. It was the *death* of the Redeemer, and not the *day* of his death, that was worthy of commemoration; and hence the Lord's supper was appointed for that purpose. It was the *resurrection* of the Saviour, and not the *day* of his resurrection, that was worthy of commemoration; and hence burial by baptism was ordained as its memorial. Now if there is no day appointed for that purpose, then those who are advocating such a day must be "seeing vanity and lying divination, saying, The Lord saith: and God hath not sent them." Eze. 13: 6. To keep a day unauthorized to commemorate redemption or Christ's resurrection, is to cast contempt upon his own institutions, and impeach his wisdom in ordaining them.

The events which lie at the foundation of redemption are the death, burial, and resurrection of the Redeemer. Yet Gitchell considers that only one of these great events is worthy of his commemoration, and he must sanctify a day for that purpose, whether it be of divine or human authority. A thing so long practiced must be right.

He continues on page 31:—

"Christ left but one appointment as he started through death's territories, and that was to, and did, take place on the Lord's day. Another appointment followed the next Lord's day, and we have reason to believe that from his resurrection the Saviour and his apostles did not keep the Jewish Sabbath; for it is certain there is not the slightest evidence that he ever afterwards regarded the old Sabbath as a holy day."

He says we have *reason* to believe that Christ and his apostles did not keep the Jewish Sabbath, etc. Why should he stop here to state that he had reasons so and so,

and not state what they were? Is it only conjecture on his part? If so, he has undoubtedly forgotten what he has said on the 8th page of his book:—

"Whatever I might conceive, would not settle the question. Persons may surmise, presume, and assert reasons, but after all it is only conjecture on their part, for the Scriptures leave us in profound ignorance as to the farther reason than that he rested on that day."

"The Scriptures leave us in profound ignorance as to the farther reason" why Christ and his apostles no longer regarded the seventh day as sacred. Men can reason best when they have something to start from, to base their reasons upon. The facts in this case are that the Saviour and his apostles had observed the seventh-day Sabbath all their lives; and one of his apostles recorded the fact that it was kept this side of the cross, and kept according to the commandment. Luke 23:56.

Gitchell says that when Christ went into the tomb, the Sabbath was buried with him; but Luke does not say so. Gitchell says that the Sabbath was blotted out, and nailed to the cross; Luke did not so understand it. Gitchell affirms that the commandment to keep the Sabbath was abolished at the cross; Luke says, Not so: the commandment was still living; for it regulated the observance of the Sabbath *this side* of the cross. No one could rest on the Sabbath day "according to the commandment" if that commandment had not been in force to require and regulate such rest. Here the Sabbath stands, this side of the cross, observed by the personal and intimate disciples of Jesus.

Gitchell also says:—

"The ushering in of the Christian dispensation on the day of pentecost was the Lord's day. And the organization of the church took place on that day, and the church has ever since recognized the Lord's day as her Sabbath."

"The first meeting of the apostles and others in the form of an assembly, after Christ's resurrection, is clearly recorded in John 20:19: 'Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and said unto them, Peace be unto you.' This is the meeting appointed of Christ before his death. Matt. 26:32. This is Lord's day."

The above is John's account of Christ's first meeting with his disciples after his resurrection. Mark and Luke have recorded the same event. Mark gives it as follows: "Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not. After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them. Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their *unbelief and hardness of heart*, because they *believed not* them which had seen him after he was risen." Mark 16:9-14.

The above is a record of the same meeting that Gitchell has spoken of as the first meeting of Christ with his disciples. He does not *tell* his reader that Christ found them celebrating the Christian Sabbath or the day of his resurrection. O no! he has prepared the mind of his reader to discover that much without reading any text of Scripture. But by and by he will tell you that the disciples made it their weekly Sabbath.

John's record of the first meeting, speaks of the disciples' being assembled, and says that the doors were shut for fear of the Jews, when Jesus came. Where in this scripture is there an intimation that the disciples were here assembled to celebrate the resurrection or even to hold religious service, or that Christ met with them for the purpose of conferring sacredness upon the day? There is not one word or sentence of that kind. Yet in the absence of all this, Gitchell finds the clear, blazing star of the Christian Sabbath!

Mark comes out with statements in regard to the nature and character of this meeting in terms too plain to be misunderstood, too positive to admit of any evasion. He says they were mourning and weeping. It is quite clear from this circumstance, 1. That they had not yet commenced their notable meeting, although they were assembled; 2. That the day had dawned upon them in their

sorrow; and 3. That they had not assembled to celebrate the resurrection, for when they heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, they believed not. From this circumstance we would naturally conclude that their minds were not yet in a proper condition to celebrate that event. Afterward two of the disciples were on their way from Jerusalem to Emmaus, when Jesus drew near and went with them. "But their eyes were holden that they should not know him. . . . And they drew nigh unto the village, whither they went: and he made as though he would have gone further. But they constrained him, saying, Abide with us; for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them." The Marys, at this late hour, were the only ones who believed he had risen, consequently they were the only ones to celebrate that event. "And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him. . . . and they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem." At a late hour they had prepared supper, and then walked back to Jerusalem, seven and a half miles; but when they arrived and told the disciples, the record says, "Neither believed they them." This certainly brings their celebration down to a late hour in the day.

But Jesus had not yet been with them; for verse 14 says: "*Afterward* he appeared unto the eleven as they *sat at meat*, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." This is the most complete record of the astonishing events that occurred upon that memorable day. Not one of the four evangelists has left on record the least shade of evidence that the disciples of Christ had assembled to commemorate the resurrection, or that Christ conferred any pre-eminence upon that day. Not one of the writers of the New Testament ever understood that day as having been set apart for religious use. No one in their day understood them to teach anything of that kind, and no accusation was ever brought against them from Jew or Gentile for disregarding the Sabbath. It had become absolutely indispensable that Christ should

appear to his disciples on that day in order to prove his own prediction that he should rise the third day. Had he not thus appeared, the Jews might well have charged him with being an impostor. These are sufficient reasons why he should appear that day; these are the plain reasons assigned by each individual record of these events for his appearing that day, and no man with an honest heart and an unbiassed judgment can ever discover in these plain, unvarnished records any other reason for his appearing. There is no intimation whatever that it was to confer sacredness upon the day. It *must* occur on some day; but it no more made the day holy on which it did occur, than his birth, death, or ascension made the days holy on which they occurred.

Gitchell presents another case, which he seems to imagine may be made to serve his purpose. He says that the second meeting was held one week after the first. John 20:26: "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you."

"Peace be unto you." This was used at that time whenever friends met, as a common, every-day salutation. It has no signification in the above records further than that.

"Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless but believing."

This is the last instance narrated where Christ convinced his disciples of his resurrection, by infallible proof. If Gitchell should succeed in locating this meeting upon the first day of the week, it would fall far short of serving his purpose, for it would still remain unproven that it was a religious meeting. Then again, granting him all he claims for these records, they are yet found wanting in every essential particular, that is, they lack the authoritative act of dedicating the day to a sacred use. He has failed to show that this has ever been done, only as he *asserts* it on almost every page of his book. For example: —

"Christ established this day, and as he is Lord of the Sabbath, we have this high authority for its adoption."

He reasons altogether from effect, and hence fails to prove a single point. His reasonings are illogical at best, yet skillfully adapted to fulfill their mission, by darkening counsel without knowledge. But to return. He says:—

"The second meeting was held just one week from the first. . . . The expression 'eight days,' the same as saying, Three days in the heart of the earth. They counted the one in which he was buried, and the one on which he rose, so they counted the day of the first meeting which took place on the day of his resurrection, and the one here spoken of as the eighth day after, making just one week."

We admit that Gitchell's mode of reconstructing the Bible to suit his circumstances seems convenient, and perhaps very necessary on his part! We think, however, that before we adopt this practice we will yield the controversy and surrender the Sabbath; for when we espouse a cause which drives us to the extremity of torturing every text of Scripture we produce in its defense, we hope that we shall be consistent enough to change our practice, instead of changing God's word, and even his law, in order to make it conform to our practice.

"After seven days" is the chosen term of the Holy Spirit when designating just one week. "After eight days" most naturally implies the ninth or tenth day. But allowing it to be the eighth day, it fails to prove that this appearance of the Saviour was upon the first day. Those who were to come before God from Sabbath to Sabbath to minister in his temple, were said to come "after seven days." Compare 1 Chron. 9:25 and 2 Kings 11:5. See also Matt. 17:1; Mark 9:2; Luke 9:28. Gitchell says:—

"Christ established this day, and as he is Lord of the Sabbath, we have this high authority for its adoption. That he would occasion such a day was intimated in a prophetic psalm."

That such a work as an attempt to change God's law has not only been intimated, but plainly predicted by prophecy, we freely admit. It is found in Dan. 7:25: "He shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change

times and laws." All who observe the first day of the week, or Sunday, instead of the seventh day, admit that there has been a change. We inquire, By what authority has the change been made? Gitchell says that Christ made the change, but the prophecy foretold that the beast—the man of sin—the little horn—should think to do this very work. Did Christ do the work foretold of Antichrist? Gitchell argues in the affirmative, and contends that there is a prophetic psalm indicating it. He says:—

"In this psalm, which an apostle applies to Christ, we have these words: 'The stone which the builders refused has become the head-stone of the corner. . . . [The part omitted is this: This is the Lord's doing; it is marvelous in our eyes.] This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it.'"

Edward Beecher, in his "Papal Conspiracy Exposed," p. 226, says:—

"Another presumptive argument that the system is a stupendous fraud, is found in the extreme scantiness of the scriptural proof by which it is sustained. There is no specific, formal, and definite statement of the system in the Bible, such as a system of power like this ought to bear. Compare the statement of power of officers in the laws of Moses, and the Constitution of the United States, and in the case of Christ, with the statements claimed for this corporation as its scriptural proofs."

All Protestants will agree that he reasons well, and that the papacy by this test must fall to the ground. But the same reasoning will also undermine the pillars for Sunday-keeping. For there must be an "extreme scantiness of the scriptural proof." If there are "specific, formal, and definite" statements of this institution in the Bible, "such as a system of power like this ought to bear," why are they not brought forward? Would a legion of thorough controversialists publish volume upon volume on this question, and not bring as much as one to the front? Certainly there must be not only extreme scantiness, but complete nihilism.

Follow Mr. Beecher's plan, and compare the scriptural evidences claimed for the first day, with those claimed for the Sabbath of the Old Testament, and how insignificant the former appear! According to this author, this fur-

nishes a strong presumptive argument that the Sunday institution is a "stupendous fraud."

We will now hear what Gitchell has to say on the prophetic psalm:—

"Here we have the work of Christ in the making of a specific day, with its glad and joyous observance. This is the Christian Sabbath, the Lord's day, commemorating an event which is sufficient to inspire the whole world with joy and gladness. It is an appropriate day. How can we rejoice on Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath, which was the dark period that Jesus lay in the grave, and death triumphed over him? But how can we suppress joy when the morning light of the first day breaks upon us? Then Christ conquered death, quit the tomb, and brought life and immortality to light."

The text—Ps. 118: 22-24—is claimed as strong proof in support of the Christian Sabbath, and yet he has found it necessary to assume the very points which he should prove: 1. "Here we have the work of Christ in the making of a specific day"; 2. "This is the Christian Sabbath, the Lord's day"; 3. "It is an appropriate day; . . . but how can we suppress joy when the morning light of the first day breaks upon us?"

The prophet does not say we will rejoice and be glad in the same day of every week; but, "We will be glad and rejoice *in it*," that is, in *that day*, whatever it may be. Christ did not rise on the first day of every week, but on one single day; and we may very well rejoice and be glad in that day without keeping any Sabbath in connection with it. Abraham rejoiced and was glad in the day of Christ; but he kept no Sabbath in honor of it. John 8: 56. He goes altogether on assumption when he applies the words of the psalmist to the resurrection of Christ; because "the day which the Lord hath made" is the same in which Christ went in by the gates of righteousness. Ps. 118: 19, 20: "Open to me the gates of righteousness: I will go into them, and I will praise the Lord: this gate of the Lord, into which the righteous shall enter." Though Christ did come up from the gates of death on the day of his resurrection, he did not formally enter by "the gates of righteousness" till that day when he ascended from Mount Olivet, which was not the

first day of the week. His supreme power and eternal sonship were declared most gloriously on the day of his resurrection; but it was on the day of his ascension that his mediatorial righteousness was formally approved by the Father; while it was visibly manifested, in the presence of the whole universe, that the door of heaven had been opened to all true believers. Thus shouted the seraphim, and all the host of Heaven, "Arise, O Lord, into thy rest; thou, and the ark of thy strength. Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness; and let thy saints shout for joy!" Ps. 132: 8, 9. Therefore this day could not be the day of his resurrection, for it did not come until the day of his ascension.

Again, the "day which the Lord hath made" is the same in which "the stone which the builders refused" became "the head-stone of the corner." Ps. 118: 24, 22. What is the Lord's doings? and how is it marvelous in our eyes?—The stone which the builders refused is made the head-stone of the corner. Christ did not become the head-stone of the corner until he sat down on the right hand of God, on his throne in heaven. For when Christ became the head of the corner, he became "the head over all things to the church." *Proof*: Eph. 1: 20-22: "Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead [or, having raised him from the dead], and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church."

From this it is manifest that Christ became the head-stone of the corner when he ascended to his Father, and our Father; to his God, and our God. Then the glorious building of grace has its foundation, not on earth, but in heaven, where Jesus, the corner-stone, "elect and precious," sits at the right hand of God, and is constantly occupied in gathering from afar the "lively stones" of the glorious edifice. Blessed forever be his holy name!

But to quote again from Gitchell (p. 33):—

"When the day of pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place." This was the day to celebrate the law given on Sinai, for it was the day God came down on the mount to covenant with Israel. Now that covenant, the law, is done away, and God comes down and fills the disciples of the new covenant with the Holy Ghost, establishing the new law in their hearts, which is supreme love to God and self love to man. No person of candor can deny this being the first day of the week. On this day and time the Christian church was organized, and three thousand were baptized and added to the church."

1. The reader will bear in mind the fact that at the present juncture there has been no evidence produced that a first-day Sabbath has been inaugurated. 2. There is no intimation that the disciples came together on this occasion to celebrate any particular day of the week, or that the Holy Spirit was showered from above to signalize it as the Christian Sabbath. 3. Had the sacred writer designed to show that a certain day of the week was honored by the event narrated, he would doubtless have plainly stated the fact, and *named the day*. But he says nothing as to the day of the week. 4. There was a great and notable event here marked by the Holy Spirit, which was the antitype of the feast of pentecost, the day of the week on which it occurred being passed in silence. But in this scripture Gitchell, as usual, has taken the liberty to reverse the order, making the day of the week, which the Holy Spirit has not even mentioned, but which he assumes to be the first day, the chief motive, and passes in silence over the most important thing which the Holy Spirit has so carefully noted, — that this great event occurred on the day of pentecost. An edifice that can stand on such a foundation must be simply a thing of the imagination, and a wild imagination at that.

In reply to his statement that this "was the day to celebrate the law given on Sinai," but as that law was done away God established a new law in the hearts of the disciples, we would refer him to what he says on p. 51: —

"Thus tersely rehearsing the ten commandments, I am not afraid to appeal to the candid for a decision that the fourth commandment is not natural law, and therefore can be laid aside at the option of the commander, and man would say, Amen. But let Jehovah send a person to . . . do violence to either of the nine commands, and the intelligent will not sanction it."

Then on p. 56 he says that if one really loved God, he would have a sacred regard for the first three commandments; and if he truly loved his neighbor, he would have the same regard for the last six. Then he says: —

"The Christian . . . establishes the very principles contained in the law."

But here, in speaking of the pentecost, he says that the old covenant, the law given on Sinai, is done away, and now "God comes down and fills the disciples of the new covenant with the Holy Ghost, establishing the new law in their hearts, which is supreme love to God and self love to man," — precisely the same principles he has claimed for nine tenths of the old law. Now we have learned these facts: 1. That the law was done away, nailed to the cross, and died when the Saviour died; 2. That it was buried with Christ; 3. That Christ was raised from the dead, but the law was dead and buried forever, "Sabbath and all;" 4. That fifty days this side of the cross Gitchell finds no law; for the old was gone, and the new had not yet come; 5. That God was dethroned, so far as the government of this world was concerned, for no government can exist an instant without law; 6. That for fifty days God had no law for the government of this world, and as where no law is, there can be neither obedience nor transgression, it follows that there could be neither sin nor righteousness; hence there were fifty days in which all manner of iniquity might be committed without sin; and 7. That God had broken down the distinction between right and wrong, and taken away the only rule by which his subjects could know their duty to him and their fellows, and then had gone through the farce of re-enacting nine precepts just as they were before, and had done it so privately that only a few could ever know it, and had thus exposed the vast majority to ignorant transgression and its eternal consequences.

Where is such re-enactment recorded? Only "those things which are revealed belong to us." Deut. 29: 29. Gitchell says this re-enactment occurred on the day of pentecost; but no such thing is revealed.

These are Gitchell's arguments, fairly stated. His theory implies that Christ abolished the Father's law, de-

stroyed his government, and set up one of his own over its ruins, and thus became the ringleader in rebellion, and so justified men in their disloyalty to God! Was this what he meant in his prayer when he said, "I have glorified Thee on the earth, I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do"? If Christ did what he is thus charged with doing, he did the will of Satan, and what that fallen angel had for thousands of years been trying in vain to do! But he says: "I am not come to subvert, but to ratify. For, indeed, I say to you, Heaven and earth shall sooner perish, than one iota, or one tittle of the law shall perish without attaining its end. Whosoever, therefore, shall violate, or teach others to violate, were it the least of these commandments, shall be in no esteem in the reign of heaven; but whosoever shall practice and teach them, shall be highly esteemed in the reign of heaven." — *Campbell's Version*. The justice of this rendering will be seen in the next verse: "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Christ accused the scribes and Pharisees of making void one of the commandments of God through their traditions. But they did not make them all void, in order to get rid of that one.

If the law were abolished, then what was sin before was not sin afterward! Then why did Christ call on men to repent of their transgressions of the law, if he were about to release them from its obligation by destroying it, whether or not they repented? Only fifty days after his death, the apostles, according to his instructions, went out preaching repentance for what was done before he died, without intimating that the least change had taken place in the law they had transgressed. The decalogue is the only complete moral code ever given to man. As we have elsewhere stated, so we repeat, that there could not be another, for two perfect moral codes can no more exist at the same time than can two universal governments or two supreme beings. Then if it were abolished, we would have no need of an atonement, a high priest, or a mediator; for "where no law is, there is no transgression." Rom. 4: 15.

The first sermon preached on the day of pentecost, thundered the command, *Repent!* and that, too, with reference to their transgressions before Christ died. Gitchell says:—

"No person of candor can deny this [the day of pentecost] being the first day of the week."

Let us hear what others have said in regard to that.

H. B. Hackett, D. D., Prof. of Biblical Literature in Newton Theological Institute, thus remarks:—

"It is generally supposed that this pentecost, signaled by the outpouring of the Spirit, fell on the Jewish Sabbath, our Saturday." — *Comments on Acts 2: 1*.

Dr. Albert Barnes says:—

"If the views of the Pharisees were followed, and the Lord Jesus had with them kept the passover on Thursday, as many have supposed, then the day of pentecost would have occurred on the Jewish Sabbath, that is, on Saturday. — *Kühnol, Lightfoot*. It is impossible to determine the truth on this subject; nor is it of much importance. The day of pentecost was kept by the Jews also as a festival, to commemorate the giving of the law on Mount Sinai." — *Notes on Acts 2: 1*.

Jennings, in "Jewish Antiquities," p. 359, says:—

"Since Christ ate his last passover on the same day with the rest of the Jews, as we have already proved, namely, on the fourteenth of Nisan, which was Thursday, the next day, on which he was crucified, must be the first day of the feast of unleavened bread; therefore, the sixteenth day, the Saturday, was the first day of the seven weeks betwixt that and the pentecost; consequently the fiftieth day, or the morrow after the seventh Sabbath or week, which was the day of pentecost, must fall on the Saturday, or the Jewish Sabbath."

Olshausen, the well-known German commentator, says:—

"Now since, according to the accounts given regarding the time of the feast, the passover in the year of our Lord's death fell so that the first day of the feast lasted from Thursday evening at six o'clock till Friday evening at the same hour, it follows of course that it was from Friday evening at six o'clock that the fifty days began to be counted. The fiftieth day fell, therefore, it appears, upon Saturday." — *Comments on Acts 2: 1*.

Dr. Adam Clarke does not say a word on the subject ; which is an argument in itself ; for he never failed to note when an inference could be drawn for Sunday.

Dean Alford, in his "New Testament for English Readers," says on this text :—

"The question, on what day of the week this day of pentecost was, is beset with the difficulties attending the question of our Lord's last passover. (See notes on Matt. 26:17 and John 18:28.) It appears probable, however, that it was on the Sabbath, *i. e.*, if we reckon from Saturday, the 16th of Nisan."

Now we will reply to Gitchell's statement, that those who keep the seventh-day Sabbath are not straitened to the necessity of locating this event upon the seventh day of the week, nor of removing it from the first, as their reasons for keeping the Sabbath are not based upon scriptures that say nothing about it. But he says:—

"The change under consideration was authorized by apostolic example, which has all the weight of positive precept. 'And upon the first day of the week, when his disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow.' The manner in which this Scripture is introduced, teaches that it was a custom to meet stately on the first day of the week ; again, that it was their practice to take the sacrament on that day ; also, that it was for religious services. This is a Sabbath day, and takes place the first day of the week. *The Lord's day.* Acts 20:7."

Acts 20:7-12 records the only instance of a religious meeting's being held on the first day of the week to be found in the New Testament. Now if apostolic example in this case contains all the weight of positive precept, as he has declared, then it becomes a matter of sufficient importance to solicit our careful investigation. Then let us ascertain, 1. On what part of the first day this meeting was held ; 2. What portion of that day was occupied in that meeting ; 3. What is determined respecting the day on which it occurred ; and 4. How the disciples spent the remainder of the day.

In Acts 20:8 we read : "And there were many lights in the upper chamber, where they were gathered together." If Gitchell had only looked at this meeting through the many lights that were burning, he must have arrived at more correct conclusions concerning it. Take this in

connection with the last clause of the seventh verse, which Gitchell omits reading (for some purpose of his own, no doubt),—"and continued his speech until midnight,"—and we have the fact clearly revealed that it was a night meeting. Paul then healed the young man that fell from the window, and was taken up dead ; and had come up again, and broken bread and eaten, etc. Verse 11. We learn from this that the breaking of bread took place after midnight. According to Bible reckoning this meeting commenced on Saturday night, at which hour the first day of the week commenced, and then he continued to preach till break of day, so he departed. Where? The record says, On his journey ; "for he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of pentecost." Verse 16. As Gitchell claims that apostolic example has all the weight of positive precept, in introducing this text he has furnished us a positive precept to commence our work early on Sunday morning, as Paul did. But he may take the position that the meeting was held on the night following the first day of the week. In that case, if the present Roman method of reckoning time be followed, it would make the meeting just as much on the second day of the week as on the first, and as the breaking of bread was after midnight, and this example has all the weight of positive precept, the sacrament is to be administered on Monday morning some time between midnight and day-break. This is the most favorable construction that it is possible to give when carefully considered from Gitchell's standpoint.

But before dismissing this text, let us look at it from the Bible standpoint. According to Bible reckoning, the reckoning by which Paul and the disciples were governed, the evening was the first part of the day : "The evening and the morning were the first day." Gen. 1:5. And so of the second and third days. Again, "From even to even shall ye celebrate your Sabbaths." Lev. 23:32. So the first day of the week in Paul's time commenced with what would be, according to the present reckoning of time, Saturday evening ; and consequently that meeting at Troas was held on what would now be Saturday night. And that no man may think this a fancy of our own, we

will give a few quotations from standard authorities, sustaining this point:—

Kitto, whose "Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature" is a standard work, in noting the fact that this meeting at Troas was an evening meeting, speaks thus (art. Lord's Day):—

"It has, from this last circumstance, been inferred by some that the assembly commenced after sunset on the Sabbath, at which hour the first day of the week had commenced, according to the Jewish reckoning (Jahn's Biblical Antiquities, sec. 398), which would hardly agree with the idea of a commemoration of the resurrection."

Prof. Hackett comments on this text thus:—

"The Jews reckoned the day [in its broad sense] from evening to morning, and on that principle the evening of the first day of the week would be our Saturday evening."

Prynne, in his "Dissertation on the Lord's Day Sabbath," pp. 36-41, thus states this point:—

"Because the text saith there were many lights in the upper room where they were gathered together, and that Paul preached . . . till midnight, . . . this meeting of the disciples at Troas, . . . began at evening. The sole doubt will be what evening this was. For my own part, I conceive clearly that it was upon Saturday night, as we falsely call it, and not the coming Sunday night. . . . Because St. Luke records that it was upon the first day of the week when this meeting was. . . . Therefore it must needs be on the Saturday, not on our Sunday evening, since the Sunday evening in St. Luke's and the Scripture account was no part of the first, but of the second day, the day ever beginning and ending at evening."

This testimony is ample, and incontrovertible, that this meeting was upon the evening preceding the daytime of the first day of the week. Paul preached till midnight, then healed the young man who fell from the window, and continued his speech till break of day (verse 11); and when Sunday had dawned upon them, what did he do? The record says, "So he departed." Off he goes, Sunday morning, on his long journey to Jerusalem. Verse 13. This was a very singular circumstance if Sunday was considered holy time. This fact can never be accounted for on any other ground than that they regarded it as a common working-day. And again: as

the apostolic example, as Gitchell affirms, has all the weight of positive precept, and the record being plain and unequivocal that they traveled all the light part of that day, it would more than offset the sacredness imparted to it by that meeting. Such is Paul's example, bearing all the weight of positive precept, as touching the sacredness of the first day of the week.

Gitchell's dilemma has three horns, and he can take whichever he chooses. Now if it can be made as clear, on the other hand, that the apostles have bequeathed to us an example of this kind as touching that day which Gitchell contemptuously denominates *Jewish*, we shall be ready to yield the controversy.

"Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2.

Gitchell considers this scripture proof that a collection was taken up in the churches or assemblies on the first day of the week, which proves it to have been the Lord's day. His premises are, 1. That the apostle here commands the Corinthians to take public collections on the first day of the week; 2. That therefore it was the custom to hold public assemblies on that day; whence he infers that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath, or Lord's day. But these are mere assumptions; the apostle says nothing about a Sabbath, a Lord's day, or an assembly. His words ordain exactly the reverse of a public collection. He says, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay *by him* in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." There is quite a difference between one's laying *by him* in store, and his attending a public meeting and putting his contributions away from himself into a contribution box.

"The whole question," one has said, "turns upon the meaning of the expression, 'by him'; and I marvel greatly how you can imagine that it means 'in the collection box of the congregation.'" Greenfield, in his Greek Lexicon, translates the term *παρ' ἑαυτοῦ*, "by one's self, i. e., at home;" two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of

Castellio, render it *apud se*, "with one's self, at home;" three French translations, those of Martin, Osterwald, and De Sacy, *chez soi*, "at his own house, at home;" the German of Luther, *bei sich selbst*, "by himself, at home;" the Dutch, *bij zich zelven*, same as the German; the Italian by Diodati, *appresso di se*, "in his own presence, at home;" the Spanish of Phelipe Scio, *en su casa*, "in his own house;" the Portuguese of Ferreira, *para isso*, "with himself;" the Swedish, *när sig sjelf*, "near himself;" Dr. Bloomfield, *παρ' εαυτο*, "by him;" the French, *chez lui*, "at home." The Douay Bible reads, "Let every one of you put apart with himself." Sawyer thus translates it, "Let each one of you lay aside by himself." Theodore Beza's Latin version has it, *apud se*, "at home." The Syriac reads, "Let every one of you lay aside and preserve at home."

Justin Edwards, D. D., in a labored effort to prove the change of the Sabbath, brings forward this text to show that Sunday was a day of religious worship with the early church. Thus he says:—

"This laying by in store was not laying by at home; for that would not prevent gatherings when he should come."

But in his "Notes on the New Testament," in which he feels at liberty to speak the truth, he thus squarely contradicts his own language already quoted:—

"Lay by him in store; *at home*. That there be no gatherings; that their gifts might be ready when the apostle should come."

In "History of the Sabbath," J. N. Andrews says:—

"Thus even Dr. Edwards confesses that the idea of a public collection is not found in this Scripture. On the contrary, it appears that each individual, in obedience to this precept, would at the opening of each new week, be found *at home*, laying aside something for the cause of God, according as his worldly affairs would warrant. The change of the Sabbath, as proved by this text, rests wholly upon an idea which Dr. Edwards confesses is not found in it. . . . The church at Corinth was a Sabbath-keeping church, [having learned their Christian faith by hearing Paul preach every Sabbath.] It is evident that the change of the Sabbath could never have been suggested to them by this text.

"This is the only scripture in which Paul even mentions the first day of the week. It was written nearly thirty years after the

alleged change of the Sabbath; yet Paul omits all titles of sacredness, simply designating it as the first day of the week; a name to which it was entitled as one of 'the six working-days.' It is also worthy of notice that this is the only precept in the Bible in which the first day is even named; and that this precept says nothing relative to the sacredness of the day to which it pertains, even the duty which it enjoins being more appropriate to a secular than to a sacred day."

Gitchell says (p. 34):—

"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day," etc. John was in the spirit of prophecy, and was under its influence when the first vision was exhibited; 'on the Lord's day;' the first day of the week; the Christian Sabbath, because on it Jesus rose from the dead, therefore it was called the Lord's day, and has taken the place of the Jewish Sabbath throughout the Christian world. Rev. 1."

We will again call attention to Edward Beecher's remarks in his "Papal Conspiracy Exposed," p. 226:—

"Now how easy would it have been to have started right at the beginning, if the claims of this corporation are true! But alas! what an utter void is there where indisputable proof ought to be found! True, certain things are said to the apostles, and it was implied that they were to have successors of some sort, and that with them Christ would be to the end of the world; but not a step can be taken without begging the question, who these successors should be."

Plainly this is true: but with Sunday-keeping it is still clearer; for not only is there an entire lack of all indisputable proof on this subject, but no "certain things are said to the apostles," or any one else, from which it can be inferred that such an institution as a first-day Sabbath was contemplated. How easy it would have been for any of the New Testament writers to pen just one text on this important subject! Thus they would have saved theologians so much trouble and perplexity in trying to defend this time-honored institution. But alas! how negligent they were! Again he says:—

"Mr. Newman (a Catholic) confesses that the passages of Scripture claimed by the papal see, are more or less obscure, and need a comment."

The same is true of those passages which it is claimed sanction the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath. Without many comments and far-fetched conclu-

sions, they are of no use to the cause. We here have an example: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." The Bible student reading this is led to inquire what day is meant by "Lord's day." From the Scriptures he learns that the seventh day is always claimed by the Lord as his day. But how different a conclusion is arrived at when Gitchell gives his own comments, as quoted above! How wonderfully this helps it! All is plain now. A man must be bigoted indeed who will not yield to such evidence! But the truth is, were it not for his own comments, this passage, like those claimed by the papal see, would be of no use to the cause. It *needs* the comment! Gitchell continues (p. 34):—

"These are the statements given in Scripture for the Christian Sabbath, while there is no evidence that a Christian assembly met on the seventh day for public worship after the resurrection. Those who profess the Christian religion and choose the Jewish Sabbath, have little to support them in the New Testament. How prone is man to affect to be wise above what is written, while he is, in almost every respect, below the teaching so plainly laid down in the divine word!"

Gitchell assumes that the Lord's day is the first day of the week. Whence he infers that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath, because on it Jesus rose from the dead. He here assumes the very point in dispute, namely, that God has appointed the first day of every week to be kept in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ. We may as well assume that every Friday is the "Lord's day," because he was crucified on Friday. Every Thursday is the "Lord's day," because he ascended on Thursday, and also because his ascension occurred a Sabbath-day's journey from Jerusalem. Acts 1: 12.

If Gitchell were called upon to give decision on his own argument, he would declare it only folly and presumption. And yet he has no hesitation in affirming that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, because Christ rose from the dead on that day. He affirms that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is not now more holy than any other; or in other words, that the blessing which God placed upon it has been taken from it, and

given to another day. Why?—Because "there remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God," therefore the seventh day must have ceased to be the Sabbath! because we will be glad and rejoice in "the day which the Lord hath made," therefore the seventh day must have ceased to be holy! because Christ showed himself to his disciples once on the first day of the week, therefore the seventh day cannot be the Sabbath! because the pentecostal effusion of the Holy Ghost happened on the first day of the week, therefore the seventh day cannot claim to be the Sabbath! because the disciples met *once* "to break bread" on the first day of the week, therefore God must have unsanctified the seventh day! because the Corinthian and Galatian Christians were commanded to "lay by them in store" on the first day of the week, for the relief of the poor saints, therefore the seventh day can be nothing more than a working-day! because John was "in the Spirit on the Lord's day," therefore the seventh day cannot be "the Lord's day," notwithstanding he has always claimed it as his holy day! because Jesus is "Lord of the Sabbath," and has the right to change it, or even annihilate it, therefore the seventh day must have ceased to be a day of rest!

Who dare say that any of these inferences follow from the Scriptures as *necessary consequences*? We have shown that they are not necessary, and that they have in every instance resulted in doing violence to the text and context!!

"The Sabbath was made for man." Are we men? If so, the Sabbath was made for us. God has blessed and sanctified the seventh day of the week, and commanded us to keep it holy for that reason; therefore as long as the seventh day continues to be divinely blessed and sanctified, we are bound to keep it holy. But it is nowhere in the Bible said that God has removed this blessing from this day, or that he has unsanctified it. Gitchell says so, indeed; but he is not the author nor finisher of the Christian's faith; nor will his unscriptural and unsupported assertions, a thousand times repeated, amount to a divine revelation. He boldly asserts that it is the will of God that we should cease to regard the sev-

enth day as holy. But we ask, Where is this revealed? What prophet or apostle has so said, directly or indirectly? It is not enough for him to assert that the first day of the week is the "Lord's day" and the Christian Sabbath, blessed and sanctified as a memorial of the work of Christ in redemption, and then to quote a few texts of Scripture that say nothing about it, and declare that his position is sustained! We admit that this is the uniform and stereotyped method of accounting for the unscriptural practice of keeping the first day of the week in lieu of the seventh; but the practice does not make it lawful. This fact alone should be considered as sufficient condemnation of that practice, and lead every candid Christian to a thorough investigation. To assert that God did not bless and sanctify the seventh day at creation, can never change the fact that he did!

I have discovered that these texts are an eye-sore to Gitchell, and he has done all that lies in his power to cover them up and hide them from view, and no doubt he wishes in his heart that they were not in the Bible. If he loved them, he certainly would not flatly contradict them. He takes up the fourth commandment to convince himself and others that God's Spirit does not mean what it says; and then takes up these passages in the New Testament which we have considered, to convince himself and others that the same Spirit means what it does not say! He does not believe that what God says repeatedly in his word can be true; but he is sure that what he does not say even once is infallibly true, and that nothing but stupidity or skepticism would presume to doubt it! Though we say the seventh day is the Sabbath, and the testimony of God's Spirit plainly affirms the same in fifty-nine passages in the New Testament, and it was the uniform practice of the church as long as she retained her primitive purity, and as long as we can trace the inspired history of the Sabbath; yet he is bold to say that "those who profess the Christian religion and choose the Jewish Sabbath, have little to support them in the New Testament, and affect to be wise above what is written, while he is, in almost every respect, below the teaching so plainly laid down in the divine word!"

But when he tells us that the first day *is*, and that the seventh *is not*, the Sabbath, and quotes as proof Acts 20:7 and a few other passages, not one of which says one word about the Sabbath, or the seventh day, or any day of rest, or holy time, or about exercises which are proper only on the Sabbath, he affirms that he has proved his position beyond all doubt, and that the only reason why we cannot see the evidence is because the veil of Judaism is over our eyes.

The apostle Paul, thirty years after the resurrection of Christ, declared boldly before his enemies that he had done nothing against the law of the Jews or the customs of their Fathers. Acts 25:8; 28:17. This could not have been true if he had even intimated in his teachings that the first day of the week was the Sabbath in lieu of the seventh day. The fact that the Jews brought no accusation of Sabbath-breaking against the disciples is sufficient evidence how they stood in relation to this question. Taking this in connection with the fact that they always called the seventh day the Sabbath, and never as much as intimated that any other day was then, or ever would be, the Sabbath in place of the seventh day, we have herein an overwhelming argument in the New Testament Scriptures in favor of the seventh-day Sabbath. But even these are not alone. In connection with them we have the statement that after the death of Christ, the Sabbath was kept according to the commandment. Luke 23:56. This is positive proof that the Sabbath existed and the commandment to keep it was in force this side of the cross, and if it was in force one instant this side of the death of Christ, it is in force to-day; for whatever the New Testament declares to have been abolished, it as plainly declares was abolished at the cross. And besides all this, we find no less than eighty-four religious meetings distinctly spoken of in the New Testament as occurring on the Sabbath, and in every instance the connection locates them on the seventh day of the week. God's moral law says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." But neither that law, nor any other in the Bible, says the first day is the Sabbath, or the Lord's day, or the Christian Sabbath. No commandment has ever been given to

enforce its observance, and no precept or example has been left on record by the disciples or by Christ to keep it sacred. And yet, with the darkness and obscurity that overshadow it, Gitchell discovers a clear, blazing light for his first-day Christian Sabbath. God has said, not only in his law given on Mount Sinai, but all through his word, that the seventh day is the Sabbath; and the Holy Spirit has borne witness to its truth through his Son, through the disciples of Christ, and by the infallible record of his word from Genesis to Revelation. But Gitchell has repeatedly sworn by the infinite, eternal, and unchangeable Jehovah that this record *is not true*; that the seventh day is not the Sabbath of the Lord our God; that it was always Jewish, and is now a common working-day.

THE SABBATH IN HISTORY.

On page 35, Gitchell introduces some testimony from the early Fathers, as follows:—

"Let us now turn to the historical account of the Sabbath, which will be found in church histories, compiled by the most learned Christian men of the age—Mosheim, Neander, Gregory, Butler, Milner, Gibbon, Howes, Dwight; and many more might be named who state that 'all Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week on which the triumphant Saviour rose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the express appointment of the apostles, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed throughout the Christian churches, as appears from the united testimony of the most creditable writers.'—Mosheim, ch. i, 27 p."

In the above he has quoted some things that are to be found in church history. One not acquainted with such history would think, from what he has quoted, that history was all on the side of Sunday-keeping. Allowing, for the present, that this is true, what should be our action in regard to it? Bower, in his "History of the Popes," vol. I, p. I, says:—

"To avoid being imposed upon, we ought to treat tradition as we do a notorious and known liar, to whom we give no credit, unless

what he says is confirmed to us by some person of undoubted veracity. . . . False and lying traditions are of an early date, and the greatest men have, out of a pious credulity, suffered themselves to be imposed upon by them."

Dowling, in his "History of Romanism," book 2, chap. I, says:—

"The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants." Nor is it of any account in the estimation of the genuine Protestant how *early* a doctrine originated, if it is not found in the Bible."

Dr. Adam Clarke, in his "Autobiography," p. 134, uses the following strong language:—

"We should take heed how we quote the Fathers in proof of the doctrines of the gospel; because he who knows them best, knows that on many of those subjects they blow hot and cold."

In commenting upon Prov. 8, he says:—

"But of these we may safely state that there is not a truth in the most orthodox creed that cannot be proved by their authority; nor a heresy that has disgraced the Romish church, that may not challenge them as its abettors. In point of doctrine, their authority is, with me, nothing. The word of God alone contains my creed. On a number of points I can go to the Greek and Latin Fathers of the church to know what *they* believed, and what the people of their respective communions believed; but after all this, I must return to God's word to know what he would have *me* to believe."

For a further statement concerning the authority of the Fathers, and how their writings have been corrupted by the Romish Church, the reader is referred to the "History of the Sabbath," by J. N. Andrews, pp. 193-204, third edition.

Gitchell has introduced the testimony of certain historians and Fathers, to show that all Christians in the early period of the church were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week for the solemn celebration of public worship. Even if this were true, it would fall far short of proving that it was sanctified by divine authority, or that it was considered a sacred day.

I have carefully examined the testimony of the early Fathers of the first three centuries, and I do not remember of a single instance where a claim is set forth for Sunday upon divine or scriptural authority. Neither do they

claim any more sacredness for it than is claimed for Holy Thursday and Good Friday. They all stand upon the same authority, and that is, the authority of the church. Furthermore, their custom was to use it as a day of ordinary labor when not engaged in worship. And in distinction they speak of the Sabbath as an entirely different institution, and as occurring on the seventh day of the week.

Domville bears the following testimony, which is worthy of everlasting remembrance:—

"Not any ecclesiastical writer of the first three centuries attributed the origin of Sunday observance either to Christ or to his apostles."—*Examination of the Six Texts, Supplement*, pp. 6, 7.

Gitchell mentions Mosheim and Neander as his first two witnesses that all Christians were unanimous in the observance of the first day of the week. Mosheim's statement that all Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week, etc., does not appear from the testimony of any "*credible writers*." Undoubtedly he is the only ecclesiastical writer that has ever given a testimony of this kind, and he declines giving proof, further than his unwarranted assertion, that it "appears from the united testimony of the most credible writers;" but he shoulders the whole responsibility by omitting to name them. Gitchell has ventured to name some of those credible writers. The first is Neander. But it so turns out that Neander does not agree in his testimony with Mosheim. Thus he says:—

"The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intention of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect; far from them, and from the early apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the second century a false application of this kind had begun to take place; for men appear by that time to have considered laboring on Sunday as a sin."—*Church History*, as translated by H. J. Rose, p. 186.

Thus one of Gitchell's witnesses has turned against him.

In A. D. 321, Constantine, while yet, according to Mosheim, a heathen, put forth an edict concerning the ancient Sunday festival:—

"Let all the judges and town people, and the occupation of all trades, rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture; because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines; lest, the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven."

Mosheim, in speaking of this law, says:—

"The first day of the week, which was the ordinary and stated time for the public assemblies of the Christians, was, in consequence of a peculiar law enacted by Constantine, observed with greater solemnity than it had formerly been."—*Mosheim*, century 4, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 5.

This law restrained merchants and mechanics, but did not hinder the farmer in his work. Yet it caused the day to be observed with greater solemnity than it had formerly been.

If Mosheim is correct in his statement, it had not formerly been regarded with much solemnity. Mosheim spoke these words in reference to Christians, and they prove that in his judgment, as a historian, Sunday was a day on which ordinary labor was customary and lawful prior to A. D. 321, as the records of the Fathers indicate, and as historians testify.

Gitchell next quotes a passage purporting to be from Ignatius, and to have been written some time before his death:—

"Be not deceived with heterodox opinions, nor old unprofitable follies; for if we still live according to Judaism, we confess that we have not received grace. If, then, they have indeed cast off their own principles, and are come to a new life in Christ, let them no longer observe the Jewish Sabbath, but live according to the resurrection of the Lord."—*Milner*, vol. 1, 81, 94."

But why did not Milner tell the reader where this writing can be found?

J. N. Andrews remarks as follows concerning the writings of Ignatius:—

"Of the fifteen epistles ascribed to Ignatius, eight are, by universal consent, accounted spurious; and eminent scholars have questioned the genuineness of the remaining seven. There are, however, two forms to these seven, a longer and a shorter; and

while some doubt exists as to the shorter form, the longer is by common consent ascribed to a later age than that of Ignatius."

The epistle to the Magnesians is the one from which first-day writers obtain their testimony in behalf of Sunday. But this epistle is also denominated spurious! The writers who bear record to this fact are Dr. Killen, C. F. Hudson, Sir Wm. Domville, Robinson, Kitto, and Morer. See "History of the Sabbath," by J. N. Andrews, pp. 239-244, third edition.

Gitchell says on p. 35:—

"Justin Martyr experienced the Christian faith about the year 132, and became a noble defender of the church of Christ. He was imprisoned, and died at Rome 165. He wrote much concerning the Christian worship, A. D. 138. He writes: 'On the day called Sunday there is a meeting in one place of all who reside whether in the towns or in the country, and the memoirs of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read. The reader having concluded, the president delivers a discourse instructing the people and exhorting them to imitate the good things which they have heard. . . . We all assemble together in common on Sunday because it was the first day that God, having changed darkness and chaos, made the world, and because on the day Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead. For he was crucified the day before that of Saturn, and on the day after Saturn, which is the day of the sun, he appeared to his apostles and disciples, and taught them what we submit to your consideration.'—Gilfillan's *His. Sab.*, p. 375. *Apol. Chri. Fath.* Reaves, p. 127."

The Roman people observed a festival on the first day of the week in honor of the sun. Rev. B. B. Edwards, in his "Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," says:—

"It is generally concluded that Baal was the sun; on this admission all the characters which Scripture claims for him may be easily explained. The great luminary was adored all over the East, and is the most ancient deity acknowledged among the heathen."

The worship of Baal and the worship of Jehovah were the great rival religions in Old Testament times. As observing the seventh day of the week was a sign of the allegiance of God's people to him as the Creator, so observing the sun's day was a sign of the allegiance of the sun-worshippers to that god. Mr. Edwards says:—

"The ancient Saxons gave to the first day of the week the name of Sunday, because upon that day they worshiped the sun."

And so Justin, in his "Apology" * addressed to the emperor of Rome, tells that monarch that the Christians met on "the day of the Sun" for worship. He gives the day no sacred title, and does not even intimate that it was a day of abstinence from labor, only as they spent a portion of it in worship.

Gentile converts came into the church infected with heathen proclivities and superstition. When they grew to be the majority, the ruling power of the church passed into their hands, and their prejudices and old predictions led them to adopt principles and practices more and more in conformity with heathenism, and in opposition to the Jews, as the history of the church from the second century to the Reformation abundantly proves. Especially was this true in adopting Sunday in the place of God's Sabbath. Constantine's first decree in its favor was issued when he was yet a professed idolater. Two years later, when he professed Christianity, he re-enforced that decree, with the avowed object of making a distinction between Jews and Gentiles. "Let us, then, have nothing in common with the most hostile rabble of the Jews," he said, as his reason for this act.

Historians tell us that "at this time nearly all semblance of the former purity of the church had disappeared." Roman Catholicism took form under Constantine's fostering hand; and the bishops of Rome, who became popes, enforced the sun's day in place of the Sabbath, under the pretense of being Christ's vicegerents. Then a controversy arose between the Eastern and Western churches in regard to the Sabbath and the Sunday, which continued for about two hundred years, or until the year 538, at which time the Roman Catholic element gained supereminence, and proceeded to crush out the observance of the Sabbath by fines, confiscation, and torture. The Waldensian churches, however, would not yield; but all through the Dark Ages clung to the Sabbath at the peril of their lives.

They fled into the wilderness where they were nourished of God for a time, times, and half a time from the

* This is Justin's Apology on the Sunday festival to the emperor of Rome.

face of the serpent. Rev. 12:14. And the history of the two parties proves that while the former opposed the Sabbath, the saints cherished it all through the twelve hundred and sixty years of their cruel persecution. These facts speak in thunder tones on the side of God's holy Sabbath!

But to return to Gitchell:—

"Irenæus was made bishop of Lyons A. D. 176. He was a learned man. Several volumes of his writings are still extant, and parts of his other volumes are found in various writings of the early Fathers. He writes as follows: 'On the Lord's day every one of us Christians keeps the Sabbath, meditating on the law, and rejoicing in the works of God.'"

Sir Wm. Domville, speaking of this quotation from Irenæus, says:—

"I have carefully searched through all the extant works of Irenæus, and can with certainty state that no such passage, or any one at all resembling it, is there to be found. The edition I consulted was that by Massuet (Paris, 1710); but to assure myself still further, I have since looked to the editions by Erasmus (Paris, 1563), and Grabe (Oxford, 1702), and in neither do I find the passage in question."

Dr. Dwight is referred to as authority for this language of Irenæus. It is recorded in a biographical memoir, prefixed to his theology, that by some disease in his eyes he was deprived of his capacity of reading and study from the early age of twenty-three. "The knowledge which he gained from books after the period above mentioned was almost exclusively at second hand, by the aid of others." Domville also states another fact which unquestionably gives us the origin of this quotation:—

"But although not to be found in Irenæus, there are in the writings ascribed to another Father, namely, in the interpolated epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians [that forged epistle which we have noticed], and in one of its interpolated passages [forgery upon forgery], expressions so clearly resembling those of Dr. Dwight's quotation, as to leave no doubt of the source from which he quoted."

On this testimony J. N. Andrews remarks:—

"Such is the end of this famous testimony of Irenæus, who had it from Polycarp, who had it from the apostles! It was furnished the world by a man whose eye-sight was impaired; who in consequence of this infirmity took at second-hand an interpolated passage

from an epistle falsely ascribed to Ignatius, and published it to the world as the genuine testimony of Irenæus. Loss of eye-sight, as we may charitably believe, led Dr. Dwight into the serious error which he has committed; but by the publication of this spurious testimony, which seemed to come in a direct line from the apostles, he has rendered multitudes as incapable of reading aright the fourth commandment, as he, by loss of natural eye-sight, was of reading Irenæus for himself. This case admirably illustrates tradition as a religious guide: it is the blind leading the blind until both fall into the ditch!" — *History of the Sabbath*, pp. 274, 275, third edition.

Irenæus certainly taught a very different doctrine from that of Gitchell concerning the commandments. He believed that all men must keep them in order to enter eternal life. He says:—

"Now, that the law did beforehand teach mankind the necessity of following Christ, he does himself make manifest, when he replied as follows to him who asked him what he should do that he might inherit eternal life, 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.' But upon the other asking, 'Which?' again the Lord replied: 'Do not commit adultery, do not kill, do not steal, do not bear false witness, honor father and mother, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,'—setting as an ascending series before those who wished to follow him, the precepts of the law, as the entrance into life; and what he then said to one, he said to all. But when the former said, 'All these have I done' (and most likely he had not kept them, for in that case the Lord would not have said to him, 'Keep the commandments'), the Lord, exposing his covetousness, said to him, 'If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell all that thou hast, and distribute to the poor; and come, follow me;' promising to those who would act thus, the portion belonging to the apostles. . . . But he taught that they should obey the commandments which God enjoined from the beginning, and do away with their former covetousness by good works, and follow after Christ." — Book 4, chap. 12, sec. 5.

He further says:—

"And [we must] not only abstain from evil deeds, but even from the desire after them. Now he did not teach us these things as being opposed to the law, but as fulfilling the law, and implanting in us the varied righteousness of the law. That would have been contrary to the law, if he had commanded his disciples to do anything which the law had prohibited." — Book 4, chap. 13, sec. 1.

He makes the observance of the decalogue the test of Christian character, or true piety. Thus he says:—

"They (the Jews) had therefore a law, a course of discipline, and a prophecy of future things. For God at the first, indeed,

warning them by means of natural precepts, which from the beginning he had implanted in mankind, that is, by means of the decalogue (which if any one does not observe, he has no salvation), did then demand nothing more of them." — Book 4, chap. 15, sec. 1.

It is certain that Irenæus held the decalogue (which Gitchell declares is, with all its appendages, done away and superseded by the gospel) to be now binding on all men; for he says of it in the quotation above, "which if any one does not observe, he has no salvation."

The precepts of the decalogue he rightly terms "natural precepts," that is, precepts which constitute the work of the law written by nature in the hearts of all men, but marred by the presence of the carnal mind or law of sin in the members. That this law of God pertains alike to Jews and to Gentiles, he thus affirms: —

"Inasmuch, then, as all natural precepts are common to us and to them (the Jews), they had in them indeed the beginning and origin; but in us they have received growth and completion." — Book 4, chap. 13, sec. 4.

In book 4, chap. 16, sec. 4, he asserts the perpetuity and authority of the decalogue in these words: —

"Preparing men for this life, the Lord himself did speak in his own person to all alike the words of the decalogue; and therefore, in like manner, do they remain permanent with us, receiving, by means of his advent in the flesh, extension and increase, but not abrogation."

This statement establishes the authority of each of the ten commandments in the gospel dispensation, and constitutes a complete refutation of Gitchell's no-law theory.

Returning to Gitchell, we read: —

"The ingenious and most voluminous Christian author, living in the last part of the second century and first part of the third, was Tertullian. He writes thus: 'If we spend Sunday joyfully as well as they (pagans), it is for a very different reason from the worshiping of the sun. We have nothing to do with the Sabbath in which God at one time took pleasure, which was a temporary Sabbath. We celebrate the day after Saturday.' — *Apol. v. Gent.* 17, *De Idol.* e. 14, *Adv. Ind. lib.* 4, *Apol.* e. 16."

J. N. Andrews, in his work, "Complete Testimony of the Fathers," pp. 63, 64, thus speaks of Tertullian: —

"This writer contradicts himself in the most extraordinary manner concerning the Sabbath and the law of God. [His equal in this respect, we venture to say, cannot be produced until we find the exemplification of it in our own time.] He asserts that the Sabbath was abolished by Christ, and elsewhere emphatically declares that he did not abolish it. He says that Joshua violated the Sabbath, and then expressly declares that he did not violate it. He says that Christ broke the Sabbath, and then shows that he never did this. He represents the eighth day as more honorable than the seventh, and elsewhere states just the reverse. He asserts that the law is abolished, and in other places affirms its perpetual obligation. He speaks of the Lord's day as the eighth day, and is the second of the early writers who makes an application of this term to Sunday, if we allow Clement [of Alexandria, A. D. 194] to have really spoken of it. But though he thus uses the term like Clement, he also, like him, teaches a perpetual Lord's day, or, like Justin Martyr, a perpetual Sabbath, in the observance of every day. And with the observance of Sunday as the Lord's day he brings in 'offerings for the dead' and the perpetual use of the sign of the cross. But he expressly affirms that these things rest, not upon the authority of the Scriptures, but wholly upon that of tradition and custom. [See *De Corona*, secs. 3, 4.] And though he speaks of the Sabbath as abrogated by Christ, he expressly contradicts this by asserting that Christ 'did not at all rescind the Sabbath,' and that he imparted an additional sanctity to that day which from the beginning had been consecrated by the benediction of the Father. This strange mingling of light and darkness plainly indicates the age in which this author lived. He was not so far removed from the time of the apostles but that many clear rays of divine truth shone upon him; and he was far enough advanced in the age of apostasy to have its dense darkness materially affect him. He stood on the line between expiring day and advancing night. Sometimes the law of God was unspeakably sacred; at other times tradition was of higher authority than the law. Sometimes divine institutions were alone precious in his estimation; at others he was better satisfied with those which were sustained only by custom and tradition."

It is certain from Tertullian's own testimony, that he did not base the observance of Sunday on the authority of the Bible, nor believe in spending the day in devotion altogether.

Milman, in his notes on Gibbon, speaking of Tertullian, says: —

"It would be wiser for Christianity, retreating upon its genuine records in the New Testament, to disclaim this fierce African, than identify itself with his furious invectives, by unsatisfactory apologies for their unchristian fanaticism."

And Dr. Heylyn says: —

"Tertullian tells us that they did devote the Sunday partly unto mirth and recreation, not to devotion altogether; when in a hundred years after Tertullian's time there was no law or constitution to restrain men from labor on this day in the Christian church."

Tertullian says: —

"We solemnize the day after Saturday in contradistinction to those who call this day their Sabbath."

Gitchell brings Tertullian on the stand to prove that *all* Christians were unanimous in keeping the first day of the week; but we find him testifying to the contrary, for in "Apology," sec. 21, he says they kept Sunday in opposition to those Christians who kept the Sabbath.

Gitchell continues: —

"Hilery was born of wealthy parents who gave him an extensive education. Also, he was very eloquent. He was the great combatant of Arian heresy, taking position against the Emperor Constantine and the then Arian world. He was chosen bishop A. D. 353. Hilery, writing about the Christian faith and practice, says: 'The festivity of a perfect Sabbath on the eighth, which is also the first day of the week.' Prol. in Psalm."

In A. D. 353, when Hilery was chosen bishop, Roman Catholicism had taken form, and the bishops of Rome enforced the sun's day in place of the Sabbath, under the false pretense of being Christ's viceregents. A controversy arose between the Eastern and the Western churches, not in regard to which day was the Sabbath, but to which should receive the most honor, the pagan sun's day or the Sabbath. If all Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week to religious service in lieu of the seventh, why did they contend on this question? What Gitchell is here laboring to prove has no foundation either in history or the Bible.

Gitchell writes: —

"Ambrose, bishop of Milan, says, A. D. 391: 'The Lord's day is sacred, consecrated by the resurrection of Christ.'"

We are not told where this testimony of Ambrose can be found; nor does Ambrose, if this be his language, tell us where there is authority for it in the Bible.

Gitchell says: —

"Eusebius was born A. D. 265; died 340. He became bishop in 315, and was a very extensive writer. He has justly been called the father of ecclesiastical history. Eusebius thus writes: 'The Word [Christ], by the new covenant, translated and transferred the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light, and gave us the symbol of true rest, the Lord's day, the first of the light, in which the Saviour obtained victory over death.' After mentioning further the transfer of the Sabbath and its duties to the first day of the week, he observes: 'These duties more appropriately belong to this day because it has a precedence, is first in rank and more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath. It is delivered to us that we should meet together on this day.' — Euse. com. Ps. 92."

Eusebius, in his "Ecclesiastical History," book 1, chap. 4, declares himself a no-Sabbath man. We have no doubt that he bore the above testimony relative to the first day of the week; for he is said to have been the flatterer and satellite of the Emperor Constantine. See "History of the Sabbath," p. 358, third edition. But, like all first-day advocates, he fails to give Bible proof.

Matthew says, "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week." Chap. 28:1. Mark says, "And when the Sabbath was past, . . . very early in the morning, the first day of the week." Chap. 16:1. This testimony certainly shows that the Sabbath is one day and the first day of the week is another. Even a blind man could see from this that the Sabbath is not the first day of the week, and that the first day of the week is not the Sabbath. The seventh day is the day of rest; the first day is the day on which Christ rose from the dead. "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher." Luke 23:54-56; 24:1. This testimony speaks of three days: first, the preparation day, which was the sixth, and was used in preparing for the Sabbath; second, the Sabbath, which was the seventh day, and was kept according to the commandment; because it enjoins the observance of the seventh day for the

Sabbath, but no other; third, the first day of the week, the day on which Christ rose from the dead. These three are separate and distinct days, and must not be confounded.

Did God's Spirit dictate the writing of this record? The man that will say, in the face of this testimony, that the seventh day is not the Sabbath of the New Testament (or covenant), and that the first day is, might as well affirm that the words which God's Spirit has fifty-nine times repeated, are not true, and that what it has not once spoken is infallibly true.

Eusebius, who wrote a history of the church extending from the days of the apostles to the time of Constantine, speaks of these days in the same order. Speaking of one event, he says that it occurred on the day before the Sabbath, Friday; and of another, that it happened on the very day of our Lord's resurrection.

Hence as far as Eusebius's history extends, the same Bible record of these days was recognized. As Dr. Clarke remarked with regard to the testimony of the early Fathers, if they found in the Bible what they taught, we too can find it there; if they did not find it there, it is of no authority with us.

Gitchell concludes his chapter on this subject in these words:—

"Much more might have been brought from these authors and others concerning this question, but this is sufficient for the candid inquirer."

We agree with him that sufficient testimony of this kind has been adduced for the candid inquirer; for on matters which pertain to our eternal interests, we want testimony that is reliable and true, not that which is born of corruption and fraud, and handed down through the medium of a "pious credulity" to curse future generations.

By Gitchell's own witness we have proved that all Christians were not keeping the first day of the week. We will now enlarge the foregoing historical account by inserting evidence that may reverse the matter, and show that all Christians were unanimous in setting apart the seventh day as sacred, according to the commandment, for several hundred years this side of Christ.

Coleman says:—

"Down even to the fifth century the observance of the Jewish Sabbath was continued in the Christian church, but with a rigor and solemnity gradually diminishing until it was wholly discontinued."—*Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, chap. 26, sec. 2.

Edward Brerewood, professor in Gresham College, London, says:—

"It is commonly believed that the Jewish Sabbath was changed into the Lord's day by Christian emperors, and they know little who do not know that the ancient Sabbath did remain and was observed by the Eastern churches three hundred years after our Saviour's passion."—*Learned Treatise of the Sabbath*, p. 77.

The American Presbyterian Board of Publication, in Tract No. 118, states that—

"The observance of the seventh-day Sabbath did not cease till it was abolished after the empire became Christian."

Socrates, A. D. 440, says:—

"There are various customs concerning assembling; for though all the churches throughout the whole world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath day, yet the Alexandrians and the Romans, from an ancient tradition, refuse to do this."—*Ecclesiastical History*, p. 281.

M. De la Roque, a French Protestant, says:—

"It evidently appears that, before any change was introduced, the church religiously observed the Sabbath for many ages; we of consequence are obliged to keep it."

Speaking upon the subject, when and by whom the Sabbath was changed, Sir Wm. Domville says:—

"Centuries of the Christian era passed away before the Sunday was observed by the Christian church as a Sabbath. History does not furnish us with a single proof or indication that it was at any time so observed previous to the sabbatical edict of Constantine in A. D. 321."—*Examination of the Six Texts*, p. 291.

A high authority speaks of it as follows:—

"It was Constantine the Great who first made a law for the proper observance of Sunday; and who, according to Eusebius, appointed it should be regularly celebrated throughout the Roman empire."—*Encyclopedia Britannica*, art. Sunday.

The "Encyclopedia Americana," art. Sabbath, says:—

"Constantine the Great made a law for the whole empire (A. D. 321), that Sunday should be kept as a day of rest in all cities

and towns; but he allowed the country people to follow their work on that day."

Of Constantine's decree, Milman, the learned editor of Gibbon, says:—

"The rescript, commanding the celebration of the Christian Sabbath, bears no allusion to its peculiar sanctity as a Christian institution. It is the day of the sun which is to be observed by the general veneration."—*History of Christianity*, book 3, chap. 1.

Prynne says:—

"The seventh-day Sabbath was . . . solemnized by Christ, the apostles, and primitive Christians, till the Laodicean Council did, in a manner, quite abolish the observation of it. . . . The Council of Laodicea (A. D. 364) . . . first settled the observation of the Lord's day."—*Dissertation of the Lord's Day Sabbath*, 1633, p. 163.

John Ley, an English writer of 1640, says:—

"From the apostles' time until the Council of Laodicea, which was about the year 364, the holy observance of the Jews' Sabbath continued, as may be proved out of many authors; yea, notwithstanding the decree of that council against it."—*Sunday a Sabbath*, p. 163.

Alexander Campbell, in a lecture in Bethany College, 1848, said:—

"Was the first day set apart by public authority, in the apostolic age?—No. By whom was it set apart, and when?—By Constantine, who lived about the beginning of the fourth century."*

The following was taken from the *Christian Union* of June 11, 1879. The concessions made in the answer—and with it, it seems, any well-informed and unprejudiced person must agree—are utterly fatal to any claims for Sunday sanctity.

"When, why, and by whom was the day of rest changed from the seventh to the first? Has the Christian Sabbath been observed since the time of the apostles?—*Reader*.

"*Ans.*—The Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, not by any positive authority, but by a gradual process. Christ was in the tomb during the seventh day. He rose upon the first. The Christians naturally observed the first day

* Many of the above extracts are taken from "Facts for the Times," a work composed of valuable historical extracts. It is published by the Review and Herald Publishing Co., Battle Creek, Mich. Price 50 cts.

as a festal day in the early church, and as gradually the Gentile Christians came to be the vast majority of the church, they cared little or nothing about Jewish observances of any kind, abandoned the Jewish Sabbath along with temple services and the like, and thus by a natural process the first day of the week came to take its place."

The Chicago *Inter Ocean*, answering the questions, Who changed the Sabbath day, and when? and Is Sunday the first day of the week? says:—

"The change of the day of worship from the Sabbath, or the last day of the week, to Sunday, the first day of the week, was done by the early Christians; but the work was so gradual that it is almost impossible to determine when the one left off and the other began. It was not until after the Reformation that the change was confirmed by any legal enactment. In the first ages after Christ it does not appear that the Christians abstained from their regular business upon that day, but they were accustomed to meet early in the day, and indulge in singing and some other religious services. It was not until the beginning of the third century that it became customary for Christians to abstain from their worldly business and occupation on that day."

The above evidence is directly to the point. It shows clearly that Sunday observance crept into the church through heathen proclivities; for it was when the Gentiles were the vast majority in the church that Sunday made its progress.

Gitchell says that God has blessed the Christian church for centuries past in keeping the first day of the week.

It is true that good men have kept Sunday, and neglected the Sabbath. It was a sin of ignorance; nevertheless, it was a sin. On account of their good motives, God blessed them; but in blessing them he did not approve of their sins, and make it safe for others, having the light, to transgress his commandments. God has blessed men notwithstanding their sins of ignorance, but he never blessed them in consequence of them.

But Gitchell failed to produce evidence for his assertion. We have never yet been able to point to any evidence that the Lord has ever blessed Sunday-keeping. Are Sunday-keepers all in unity? Do they "all speak the same things"? and are there "no divisions" among them? They talk of converting the world; but have

they the essential and indispensable characteristic, the only thing that will cause the world to believe their testimony? "That they all may be *one*; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one in us*, that the world *may believe* that thou hast sent me." Instead of this unity which is indispensable to make their testimony believed, they are "blessed" all into fragments! and the process of division is almost daily going on. Are their numbers the evidence that the Lord blesses them? Then Protestants ought to return to the "mother church;" for she greatly outnumbers them. From her they obtain their only authority for Sunday-keeping; for that is where Sunday-keeping as a Christian institution originated. But if Mohammedans and pagans *still* outnumbered them, they could not claim by this rule that the Lord blessed them.

But, says an objector, so many have died in triumphant faith and hope, who always kept the first day as the Sabbath.

God, the judge of all, knows the motives of the heart. He knows every individual that has endeavored to live up to all the light he had. The word of God being true, knowledge is increasing (Dan. 12:4), and the present generation will be judged by the increasing light. "This is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." John 3:19. What is the evidence that the Lord blesses him in Sunday-keeping? No doubt he can testify that the Lord has blessed him, and that he is not a stranger to Christian experience. We concede all this. It is possible that he has often enjoyed the Spirit of the Lord. But he never did while opposing the truth of his word, and fighting against *enlightened* conviction of duty. There are more spirits than one in the world, and God's Spirit is always in harmony with his word. Gitchell is here trying to prove by the witness of his spirit, that God's word, which says "the seventh day is the Sabbath," is not true. The Devil may bless men in contradicting the word of the Lord, but the Spirit of the Lord never did, and never will. "Try the spirits whether they are of God." 1 John 4:1. "To the law and to the testi-

mony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:20.

In this scripture we are told that spirits that speak not according to the law and the testimony, are spirits of darkness; there is no light in them. When Gitchell produces law and testimony from God's word that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, the Christian Sabbath, we shall be more than anxious to conform to it. But as it stands, we have God's law and the testimony of his word that the seventh day is the Sabbath, accompanied by repeated promises that he will especially bless all who lay hold of his covenant and keep the Sabbath. Will Gitchell find one promised blessing for the weekly observance of any other day except the one commanded in the decalogue? or a curse pronounced for doing our own work on any other day?

On the 59th page of his book he brings objections against keeping the seventh-day Sabbath. One is because the day does not begin all over the world at once.

In answer to this we will first mention, that in case he should ever find this in the way of his Sunday, we can do much better for him than he has done for us. He tells us that this alone is fatal to seventh-day keeping; and certainly no person would be more likely to discover it. His opportunities in this line will give him my preference, to any other man I have met; for he has ransacked time, past, present, and future; earth and sea, near and remote, in search of arguments against the existence of Jehovah's rest day. He has explored the past dispensation and the present; he has gone to the patriarchs, to Moses, and to Christ, to Jews and Gentiles, to pope and pagan; he has called on revelation, reason, and history, astronomy and philosophy; he has traversed the earth with electric speed; he has leaped from Asia to Alaska; he has gone around the world with the sun, and back again; he has been to the north pole, and nearly to the south; and has performed almost every other conceivable antic in his raving search for some reason to show that it would have been a great mistake in God to have given to man in the beginning a hallowed rest day as a memorial of himself and his great work. It would have been a mistake, be-

cause each day goes around the world, and it cannot come to all the inhabitants of earth at once; therefore it would be impossible to keep it. But when Sunday comes, it performs its office work without the least difficulty, and the Christian world has succeeded in keeping it for centuries in the past, and will continue its observance while time endures.

We have now gone through with Gitchell's arguments on the institution of the Sabbath and the law of God, and have tried to give them a fair and candid examination. We now invite the reader to decide honestly how we have met the foregoing positions and objections to the Lord's holy Sabbath.

Reader, be candid, and make sure that you decide according to the word which will judge you at the last day. It is a decision whose results will follow you to the judgment seat of Christ. There we must account for every action here. Therefore the servant who has done his Master's will, who has resisted the temptations of Satan, and who has bravely endured the storms of the sea of time, will receive a glorious crown and eternal life, will dwell amid the radiance of the glory of God, and will enjoy the blissful society of all the redeemed forever and ever. Then let us search for the truth until it is found, and cherish it as a precious gem.

"Truth is the gem for which we seek,
O, tell us where shall it be found!
For this we search, and pray, and weep,
That truth may in our hearts abound.

"Then, as we would our God obey,
In letter, and in spirit too,
O, let us keep the seventh day,
For it is plainly brought to view."

The Coming Conflict: of the United States to become an Oppressive Power. By Eld. W. H. Littlejohn. The Sabbath question fully discussed. 428 pp. \$1.00

The Great Controversy between Christ and his angels, and Satan and his angels, in four volumes. By Mrs. E. G. White. These volumes cover the time from the fall of Satan to the destruction of sin and sinners at the close of the one thousand years of Rev. 20. Each, 400 pp.
Vol. I. Old Testament History, reaching to Christ. (Present edition exhausted.) \$1.00
Vol. II. Life and Ministry of Christ. 1.00
Vol. III. The Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ, with the Lives of his Apostles. 1.00
Vol. IV. (Illustrated.) Treats of the Christian Church in its varied experiences during the gospel dispensation, but specially at the time of the end. 1.50

The Marvel of Nations: or, Our Country; Its Past, Present, and Future, and What the Scriptures Say of It. By U. Smith. One hundred thousand issued. Elegantly bound in muslin, 298 pp. \$1.00

The Seventh-Day Adventist Hymn and Tune Book. Large size, with music. Cloth binding. \$1.50
Five other styles of binding ranging from \$1.75 to \$2.75.

Hymns for Divine Worship. Contains all the hymns in the above book, but no music.

Pocket size, in Russia leather, \$1.00
In Morocco, gilt, 1.50

Life of Wm. Miller, with portrait. This book gives interesting sketches of the Christian life and public labors of this pioneer in the Advent movement in this country. 416 pp. \$1.00

Life of Elder Joseph Bates, relating his experience of twenty-five years on ship-board, with incidents of his rise from cabin-boy up to master. Fine tint paper, 352 pp. \$1.00
Plain white paper, 85 cts.

The Bible from Heaven. An argument to show that the Bible is not the work of men, but is in deed and truth the word of God. 300 pp. 80 cts.

The Soul and the Resurrection, showing the Harmony of Science and the Bible on the Nature of the Soul and the Doctrine of the Resurrection. By J. H. Kellogg, M. D. 75 cts.

Early Writings of Mrs. White. 75 cts.

A History of the Doctrine of the Soul. A work of great value. Muslin binding. 75 cts.

Smith's Diagram of Parliamentary Rules. Indispensable to Parliamentarians. 50 cts.

Facts for the Times. A volume of valuable Historical Extracts on the present truth. Excellent for Bible students. In muslin. 284 pp. 50 cts.

Testimonies for the Church. Nos. 31, 32. Each, 50 cts.

The Song Anchor. A popular collection of songs for the Sabbath-School and praise service. Bound in muslin. 50 cts.

Temperance Song Book. An unequalled book. Temperance people are lavish in its praise. 30 cts.

Better than Pearls. A superb collection of very choice music and words. 40 cts.
In boards, 30 cts.

Pearly Portals. An excellent book. 35 cts.

Songs for Class and School. A truly meritorious book for teaching purposes. 35 cts.

Joyful Greeting. The latest, the richest, the cheapest, and altogether the best S. S. song-book in the market. In boards, 216 pp. 35 cts.
In muslin covers, 50 cts.

The United States in the Light of Prophecy: or, an exposition of Rev. 13: 11-17. By Eld. U. Smith. Dealing with our own land, and applying to our time. Of surpassing interest to every American reader. 186 pp. Paper covers, 25 cts.

A Word for the Sabbath: or, False Theories Exposed. A poem by Eld. U. Smith. 40 pp. 30 cts.
Glazed paper covers, 15 cts.

The Advent Keepsake. A collection of Bible texts for each day in the year, on the subjects of the Second Advent, the Resurrection, etc. 25 cts.

The Women of Mormonism. A scathing arraignment of this vile system, which is over-spreading our country like the frogs and locusts of Egypt. Should be circulated everywhere. Contains statements from government officials and prominent clergymen. Illustrated. In muslin binding, \$2.00
Other styles ranging from \$1.25 to \$3.00.

Sunshine at Home. A bright, sparkling book for the family circle, brimful of good sense, and perfectly free from "trash." 128 quarto pages, highly embellished (Revised edition, gilt, \$1.75.) \$1.50

SABBATH-SCHOOL HELPS.

Bible Lessons for Little Ones, No. 1. Flexible cover. 15 cts.

Bible Lessons for Little Ones, No. 2. Flexible cover, with map. 20 cts.

Bible Lessons for Children, No. 3. 25 cts.

Bible Lessons, No. 4. With map. 25 cts.

Bible Lessons, No. 5. 25 cts.

Bible Lessons, No. 6. 25 cts.

Bible Lessons, No. 7. 20 cts.

Bible Lessons, No. 8. 20 cts.

PAMPHLETS.

Helps to Bible Study. A series of Bible readings, with hints to Bible workers. 30 cts.

Our Faith and Hope. Sermons on the coming and kingdom of Christ. By Eld. James White. 182 pp. 25 cts.

S. D. A. Year Book for the year 1888. 10 cts.

The Tabernacle Lectures. A series of XXXII lectures, setting forth the doctrines of the S. D. A. people. Paper covers, 267 pp. 20 cts.

Refutation of the Age to Come. By Eld. J. H. Waggoner. 168 pp. 20 cts.

The Ministration of Angels, and the Origin, History, and Destiny of Satan. 144 pp. 20 cts.

The Nature and Tendency of Modern Spiritualism. By Eld. J. H. Waggoner. 20 cts.

Visions: Objections to Spiritual Gifts Answered. 20 cts.

The Holy Spirit, Its Gifts and Manifestations to the end of the Christian age. By Eld. J. H. Waggoner. 144 pp. 15 cts.

The Three Messages of Rev. 14: 6-12. Particularly the Third Angel's Message and the two-horned Beast. By Eld. J. N. Andrews. 144 pp. 15 cts.

The Two Laws, as set forth in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. 128 pp. 15 cts.

The Morality of the Sabbath. 96 pp. 15 cts.

Miraculous Powers. The Scripture testimony on the Perpetuity of Spiritual Gifts. Contains many interesting historical extracts. 15 cts.

Matthew Twenty-Four. A clear and forcible exposition of our Lord's discourse upon the Mount of Olives. By Eld. James White. 64 pp. 10 cts.